DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 119 SO 020 047

AUTHOR Longstreet, Wilma S., Ed.
TITLE Global Education.
INSTITUTION Louisiana Council for the Social Studies.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT Louisiana Social Studies Journal; v15 n1 Fall 1988

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Citizenship Education; *Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Pluralism; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Enrichment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Global Approach; *International Relations; *Social Studies; *World Affairs; World Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Global Education; Model United Nations

ABSTRACT

This issue contains an introduction ("The Promise and Perplexity of Globalism," by W. Longstreet) and seven articles dedicated to exploring the meaning of global education for today's schools. "Global Education: An Overview" (J. Becker) develops possible definitions, identifies objectives and skills, and addresses questions and issues in this area. "Toward a Coherent Curriculum for Global Education" (J. Becker) makes a case for improving and expanding the global dimensions of education due to the greater intermixing of peoples and cultures and the changing role of the United States in world affairs. "The Challenges Facing Global Education" (D. Metzger) identifies several barriers to the entry of global education into the social studies curriculum. "Is It a System? Building a Global Perspective in the Elementary and Middle Grades" (A. Angell) establishes the importance of systems thinking as an aid in helping students conceptualize the intricate web of relationships on the planet. "A Mock U.N. Game: Teaching Global Awareness" (J. Regenbogen) is a brief description of a mock U.N. "Global Peace Begins in Our Classrooms" (K. London) cites the importance of waging peace instead of war and through a discussion of the concepts of building for peace and instructional methods for teaching about peace shows how peace education can be instituted. "Revising the American Character: Perspectives on Global Education and Multicultural Education" (S. Fain) examines the role of multicultural education in the curriculum development process required for redefining the world view. (PPB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

L O U I S I A N A
SOCIAL STUDIES Journal
Volume XV ■ Number 1 ■ Fall 1988

ED309119

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William J. Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

GLOBAL EDUCATION

L O U I S I A N A
SOCIAL STUDIES Journal
Volume XV ■ Number 1 ■ Fall 1988

GLOBAL EDUCATION

The *Louisiana Social Studies Journal* is published annually by the Louisiana Council for the Social Studies and is dedicated to the discussion and improvement of social studies education in Louisiana. The editorial office is located in the *Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana 70148.*

CONTENTS

The Promise and Perplexity of Globalism 3
By Wilma S. Longstreet
Professor of Curriculum and Instruction
Editor, *Louisiana Social Studies Journal*
University of New Orleans

Global Education: An Overview 4
By James M. Becker
Director of International Studies in Schools
Indiana University

Toward a Coherent Curriculum for Global Education 9
By James M. Becker
Director of International Studies in Schools
Indiana University

The Challenges Facing Global Education 13
By Devon J. Metzger
Association Professor, Department of Education
California State University, Chico

Is it a System? Building a Global Perspective in the Elementary and Middle Grades 17
By Ann V. Angell
Division of Educational Studies
Emory University

A Mock U.N. Game: Teaching Global Awareness 20
By Joe Regenbogen
Teacher
St. Louis Public Schools

Global Peace Begins in Our Classrooms 22
By Katherine London
Teacher
Orleans Parish School System

Revising the American Character: Perspectives on Global Education and Multicultural Education 26
By Stephan M. Fain
Professor of Education
Florida International University

Instructions to Contributors

Editorial correspondence, including manuscripts for publication, should be submitted to *Editor, Louisiana Social Studies Journal, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana 70148.* Two copies of the manuscript should be submitted, typed, double-spaced, upper and lower case on 8 1/2 by 11 inch paper.

Editor: Wilma S. Longstreet, University of New Orleans
Produced with the assistance of the **UNO Office of Publications,** rip jesse, Director; Kim Metcalf, Assistant Director for Editorial Services; Sandra L. Furlan, Assistant Director for Illustration and Design

The Louisiana Council for the Social Studies, in all of its activities, attempts to provide a forum for scholarly debate and research findings on education. The LCSS permits divergent viewpoints and judgments without assuming the endorsement of the members of the Council. Dr. William J. Miller serves as Program Manager, Social Studies Education and Cecile LeBlanc serves as the editor of the LCSS Newsletter. The 1988 LCSS officers are as follows:

President: *Catherine St. Amant*
Supervisor of Social Studies, East Baton Rouge Parish

President-Elect: *Jane Wilson*
Teacher, Edna Karr Junior High School
New Orleans

Secretary: *Janice Landreneau*
Supervisor, Evangeline Parish

Treasurer: *Judy Seal*
Curriculum Specialist, St. Tammany Parish

Past President: *Lloyd Dressel*
Supervisor, St. Mary Parish

NCSS Liaison Person: *Ruth Thomas*
Guidance Counselor, Calcasieu Parish

The Promise and Perplexity of Globalism

Wilma S. Longstreet

A few short months ago, Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev met in Moscow to sign the historic INF agreement. I was there with them nearly every inch of the way as I sat at home in Slidell, Louisiana and watched the satellite transmission of the event. Admittedly, I didn't get behind closed doors, but I did watch the two first ladies go on a walking tour; I witnessed several newspaper correspondents interviewing average Russian citizens; and I had an excellent view of the Kremlin and the broad square that surrounds it. I was thousands of miles away, but I was there. What is more, I shared my experience with millions of others around the globe.

The potential for sharing our experiences globally is essentially a new kind of phenomenon in the history of humanity. I witness famine in Ethiopia on a little screen in my living room and I share the hunger of children that could be my children. The workers of Poland go on strike and I become one of their fervent supporters. Third-world countries threaten not to repay the billions borrowed from American banks and I feel a personal threat to my own savings.

More and more, I sense a kind of inevitability in my becoming a citizen of the world, but I hardly understand what that really means to my own way of living. Is it viable to hold allegiance to a nation and to the world as well? The immediate response is a positive one. In our nuclear world, we must learn to live together if we are to go on living at all. In the broadest of senses, we all agree.

What specifically does it mean to be a global citizen? If a world court finds my nation at fault and my nation refuses to accept the court's decision, where would my obligation lie? If U.S. factories pollute the rains that will ultimately fall in Canada killing thousands of acres of that country's forests, what ought I do as a citizen of the world?

There has been so much talk about global citizenship that we hardly realize how unclear the concept is for most of us. Global education is already a part of many of our schools' curricula, but what is it that needs to be studied? Shall we study cultural differences among the peoples of the world — a kind of worldwide, multicultural education? Do we need to know about international law and its relationship to national law? Are studies about world peace and respect for the ecology essential to global education?

This issue of the *Louisiana Social Studies Journal* is dedicated to exploring the meaning of global education for today's schools. The very first article by James M. Becker is an effort to clarify the structure of the field. Professor Fain views multicultural education from a global perspective and Professor Metzger explores the adoption of global studies in America's schools. In addition, several articles present instructional units and methods for teaching global education. Katherine London discusses peace education as a global studies topic, giving practical suggestions for classroom instruction. Joe Regenbogen shares a mock United Nations game that he uses to teach global awareness to his high school students, and Ann Angell presents a lesson plan for the elementary and middle grades.

Many of the questions I have, remain. The meaning of global citizenship is still in the making. It is, nevertheless, worthwhile to focus the attention of our young on the increasingly global nature of our lives. It will fall to them to forge a new conception of citizenship. It is a task that will need lifelong reflection.

Wilma S. Longstreet is a professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of New Orleans. She also serves as Editor for the *Louisiana Social Studies Journal*.

Global Education: An Overview

James M. Becker*

What is global education? How can it be conceptualized for purposes of curriculum planning, teacher education, and basic research? What challenges and issues are inherent in current definitions? This paper touches on the first two questions, but is mainly concerned with the third; that is, the issues surrounding current conceptions of global education. What issues are raised by efforts to implement the goals and objectives stated or implied in current conceptions?

The Search for a Definition

Finding a universally accepted definition of global education is probably impossible. In a sense, global education is like the U.S. Constitution — it is what the judges say it is. In this case the judges are educators, social scientists, accrediting agencies, school boards, state departments of education, parents, publishers, citizen groups, students — all those groups that play a part in setting the agenda for the schools. Each brings to the problem of definition their own images of the world and notions of the mission of the schools in educating children and youth.

In a sense, global education can be defined as any pattern of instruction that school districts use to satisfy the guidelines, standards, or requirements which their administration or department of public instruction have adopted concerning global education. Such definitions are not likely to convey the changing nature of guidelines. The world keeps changing and our conceptions as well as our perceptions and interpretations of the world and the way it works keep changing. This makes the matter of defining and conceptualizing global education a never-ending task.

A widely accepted concept of global education views the Earth and its inhabitants as interacting and interdependent. It recognizes that nations and peoples are closely linked in a variety of ways, including through religion, science, ethnic heritage, trade, communication systems, and transnational organizations. According to this definition, the destinies of all nations and peoples are being intertwined at an accelerating rate. It is concerned with global dynamics — the relationships between individuals, humankind, and the planet, and how these dynamics are changing our lives. Rooted in and motivated by a compelling blend of altruism and enlightened self-interest, global education is concerned with the survival of the human species, with the prospect of the fulfillment of each individual, and the enhancement of the quality of life for all. This statement taken from a longer statement by Robert Leestma is probably acceptable to most global educators.

Among the small group of earthly inhabitants who advocate promoting global perspectives, ideas about definitions, directions, and focus are plentiful. Alger, the Andersons, Hanvey, Hoopes, Leestma, Muller, Reischauer, and Richardson are among those who have advanced the thinking in this area and offered approaches designed to improve and expand global education. Much of the discussion about global education is remindful of Mark Twain's comment about education and reality. He said: "Tis noble to be good. Tis nobler to teacher others to be good," and, he added, "easier." As educators we take responsibility for helping others learn how best to understand and to participate in global affairs which places us among the "noblest." Mark Twain's comment parallels another educational maxim that suggest another failing

***Editor's Note:** In this article James M. Becker, one of this nation's leaders in global education, responds to my remark that global education is a very fuzzy concept.

among those of us who advocate changes in schools. It states that reformers are intense and focused when citing education's failures, but are expansive and general when proposing solutions.

Despite the contributions by these eminent scholars as well as by other lesser-known writers, a coherent and unified view of global education has not emerged. It is still difficult to indicate clearly how global education relates to the more traditional fields of study, or what changes will or should occur in a classroom or school that adopts a global perspective, or what changes would occur in a community or nation that took global perspectives to heart. A good start has been made, however, by Lee and Charlotte Anderson in a very compelling scenario depicting some of the characteristics of a world-centered school.

A Personal View

In my view, preparing today's students for participation in an interrelated world involves much of what has traditionally been included in international studies — the study of nations, geographic areas, cultures, international organizations and processes, and diplomacy. More, however, is required to understand and deal with the connections and ties that today link individuals into global systems. What is needed is not so much to broaden knowledge as to reinterpret it. For example, we cannot simply add women's studies or Asian studies to international studies, we need to interpret human interactions in terms of all human beings and cultures and not just men or western civilization. A major problem in implementing new ideas or programs is what to do with the existing ones. We are like the Australian aborigine who wanted a new boomerang but couldn't find a way to throw away the old one. Also needed is awareness, understanding, and skills for participating in an interrelated world.

Such interrelatedness is illustrated by a quote from Jude Waniski's book, *The Way the World Works:*

> Someone buys a bottle of Coca-Cola in a shop in New Delhi. The transaction not only adds to the revenue of the shopkeeper, but to the revenues of Coca-Cola at its Atlanta headquarters. There is also an infinitesimal impact on the world sugar market, as well as the markets for all other ingredients of Coca-Cola. Coca-Cola's shareholders and Jamaican sugar farmers trade the receipts from the sale of that one bottle in further transactions that ripple again and again through the world until every human being but the most remote hermit has been touched in some microscopic way.

Ordinary acts of citizenship today need a global perspective. The United States obviously requires the training of experts on global issues such as arms control, population, food, environmental health, or energy; it is equally (if not more) important to have a globally literate population that understands how policy decisions relating to these issues are made and how such decisions affect them — how decisions made in other countries affect them, and how their choices of food, lifestyles, energy use, family size, etc. can affect national policies as well as the lives of people who may remain forever unknown to them. The consequences of living in a global society are only beginning to dawn on many citizens, and it is difficult to turn loose of old, comfortable ideas.

The traditional, nationalistic perception of the world exemplified on such slogans as "buy American," and "American is always best" are being challenged by the popularity of Japanese automobiles, by increasing foreign investment, the increasing sale of agricultural products abroad, and the large number of students, business executives, and tourists from other countries who visit our communities. These same developments are increasing the number of issues that state and local governments must deal with that are inseparably domestic and international. These developments offer hope for the continued expansion of global education, if we can but develop a framework that helps shed light on the interactive nature of local, national, and global affairs.

International/Global Studies Objectives

Accelerating global interdependence places additional demands on our citizens. For example, the subtle connections and linkages which tie every individual's daily life into global systems provides new opportunities to learn about and participate in world affairs and requires new knowledge, new skills, and new sensitivities, including an ability to:

1. identify, analyze, and understand major historical events that have influenced the globalization of human culture;
2. comprehend long-term global trends such as population growth, economic development, the patterns or resource use, the dispersion of nuclear weapons, and the possible consequences of these trends for themselves and others;
3. identify in different societies and historical settings common, human problems;
4. recognize in other cultures the needs, behaviors, life experiences, and existential concerns common to all;
5. identify technologies, institutions, languages, and beliefs that link people in many regions of the world;
6. identify the ways in which community and state are involved in the transnational flows of goods, services, information, and people;
7. reflect on the possible consequences for self and others of different world views;
8. perceive that different lifestyles have different impacts on the earth's biosphere;
9. identify alternative choices facing public policy-makers, to reflect upon the possible consequences of alternative choices, and to lend support to policy alternatives that seem most appropriate.

Increasingly, it is necessary for U.S. citizens to embrace simultaneously a local, national, and global perspective. The ability of the United States to provide leadership in our rapidly changing

world depends upon the attitudes and behavior of the general citizenry. The values and perceptions of the public place limit and help define the actions of political leaders. Thus, it makes a difference when the public believes:

- that resources are unlimited and we can continue to consume as in the past *or* that we must develop new lifestyles that place less demand on non-renewable resources;
- that the world is divided into warring camps of "good guys" and "bad guys" *or* that nations can differ without trying to destroy one another;
- that foreigners are peculiar *or* that cultural diversity is the norm and enriches human experience;
- that the United States can survive on its military and economic strength alone *or* that few problems of consequence can be resolved without the cooperation of many nations working together.

The need for more public understanding and discussion of these issues is apparent. The schools, the one institution which reaches most citizens, plays a crucial role in such efforts.

Some Considerations in Conceptualizing Global Education

For purposes of curriculum planning and teacher education our definition or concept must suggest a basis for learning that includes or suggests concepts, skills, values, and awareness. To some extent it must reflect reality, but it also involves a selection and idealization of reality. It suggests what a mature, educated person should be as well as what a society wishes to become — or at least, what those creating the concept wish society would become.

The task is to develop or select definitions, goals, and objectives that will help curriculum planners organize content and teaching strategies within the limits of time, resources, teaching interest and capabilities, and the limitations and supports provided by the institution. It requires simplifying the complex, gliding over nuances and ignoring ambiguities and incongruities. The problem lies not so much in accepting the concept in principle, but in making it operational or living with it in practice.

In practice, operationalizing a concept usually requires reconciling the often-conflicting claims of society such as the traditional academic disciplines or curriculum patterns, the interests and concerns of students, and the existing institutional arrangements. These influences rest on more basic assumptions, perceptions, understandings, and values related to the meaning of reality, concepts of human nature, and the nature of truth and knowledge.

In essence, the process of developing a concept of global education is both intellectual and ethical. It involves an analysis of individual and social needs, including the student, the teacher, society, the resources, including the materials and experiences available and the structures — the institutional setting. The process is also an ethical one, involving implicit or explicit value assumptions about the nature of the learner and his or her capacity to learn, the role of individuals in society, a notion of "what knowledge is of most worth," and assumptions about what will work in the educational system.

Since what is taught in schools idealizes the past, is selective about the present, and projects an image of the future, there is plenty of opportunity for differences of opinion regarding how the past, present, and future should be conceptualized.

Global education challenges some of the basic assumptions and influences which undergird the dominant models of education that have prevailed in the United States and much of the industrialized world for the last few centuries. Is it any wonder that a number of troublesome issues confront us? Among these assumptions are:

1. The world is essentially rational and we know it through the hard sciences;
2. We can control our physical environment through technology;
3. Bureaucratic organization and the technology of human behavior enables us to control our human environment;
4. Change is growth and growth is progress, stability results in stagnation and decline means decay;
5. Materialism is a major operating value. It emphasizes the consumption of goods, services, and experiences;
6. Individualism is a crucial value stressing competition for scarce resources and status;
7. Pragmatism, stressing how more than why, is desirable;
8. The schools' functions are mainly to socialize children and youth in these principles and to sort student clienteles into various academic and vocational slots.

Society is viewed in terms of nation-states that seek economic growth in terms of gross national products, certain patterns of production and consumption, and provides protection for their citizens by mobilizing for the common defense. Courses of subjects are specialized bodies of knowledge that students "take" and are "graded" in. Students are largely consumers of education, to be trained, sorted, and socialized for specialized tasks of society. The school system reflects the industrial system, using similar management techniques, the same vocabulary regarding achievement, and the same criteria for efficiency. These assumptions and influences undergird a concept of education that is coherent and consistent with the expectations of a modern, industrial society.

Increasingly, the sources in which many of these assumptions and influences are rooted are undergoing transformation. Notions of individualism, nationality, confidence in science, technology, growth, and progress are being called into question. The process of reflection and questioning is found not only among youth, in the women's movement, and in minority groups but also among futurists, scholars, and some government leaders.

On the global scale a new sense of interdependence seems to be emerging, new scarcities and general social and economic instability seems to be undermining the social consensus on which the existing models of education are based. Global education with its emphasis on the interrelated nature of the modern world and the global nature of many of today's problems offers a contrasting

model.

It is against this backdrop that the issues stemming from the concept of global education need to be considered.

Conceptualization alone will not solve such problems or eliminate disagreements. Agreement on the nature of human nature or the purpose of society or of the schools is not likely to be reached in any foreseeable future. Conceptualization is a never-ending process, taking into account present conditions, future needs, and the process of change. Appropriate or adequate conceptualization, like policies, cannot be determined purely through rational analysis. Those responsible for education depend upon the support of various groups — taxpayers, unions, professional associations, publishers, accrediting agencies. Program decisions are more often outcomes of struggles for control or support rather than dispassionate intellectual inquiries about the ideal form of education. We must learn to use our windows of opportunity — the moon landing, oil crises, trade deficits, etc. to create safety nets for global education.

Questions and Issues

As global educators have proposed various ways of improving and expanding what is taught in schools about the world and how it works, a variety of issues have emerged. Among the real and imagined issues raised by current conceptions of global education are:

1. Will placing human affairs in a global context undermine national loyalties? Will study of our role as members of the human species and as inhabitants of planet Earth undermine our commitments to humanity more generally, lessen our resolve as citizens of a particular country, and leave us vulnerable to manipulation by other nations and people?
2. Is global education basic and needed by everyone or is it mainly for the elites in our and other societies?
3. What values are implied by the various conceptions of global education? Are these values in keeping with traditional American values as operationalized in the schools?
4. Is the term global education a misnomer given the fact that it is largely a product of U.S. educator's efforts?
5. Can global education be conceptualized in such a fashion as to satisfy those whose major interest is multicultural, bilingual, ethnic heritage, economic, law-related, citizenship, or other special focus?

One especially troublesome set of issues centers around the question, "Is global education basic for everyone or is it only for the elite?" Can it be conceptualized in a way that makes it different from the traditional elitists study of foreign policy or national security issues? Is global education another special culture or language or can it become a common culture or a common language? Are the values and dialogue associated with global education such that every interested person regardless of his or her knowledge and experience can participate in the discussion?

How we understand what is going on around us is largely a matter of the images or the perception of reality we hold. The basic orientations provided by such images do not really change readily. Those individuals who share similar images tend to flock together. Due to this sharing they give the impression that the whole world is a reliable and reasonably understandable place where everybody appreciates and understands the same thing. A common culture.

A common culture has been the primary guide to conduct for the majority of the members of every organized human society. Possessors of special cultures and knowledge have enjoyed extraordinary status and privileges. Priesthoods, intelligentsia living close to the powerful have pursued the specialized arts of learning. Literary, philosophical, and scientific traditions had their origins in the strongholds of special cultures.

How far removed these images cultivated in the special cultures are from images shared in the common culture is illustrated by an observation Goethe made over a century and a half ago:

> Mathematicians are like Frenchmen;
> Whatever you say to them,
> They translate into their own language;
> And forthwith it is something
> Entirely different.

Since Goethe's time, a revolution has occurred in the spread of special cultures requiring special learning and elaborating special perspectives. Modern societies are replete with special images and special cultures so much so that common culture seems less viable.

Common agreement on what is real, true, or important is threatened by growth of many specialized perspectives. Is global education just one more special perspective? Are we doomed to translate what is happening around the world into our own comfortable culture perspective? Those who have traveled or studied the world from holistic perspective through religion, philosophy, or other means and have come to see the world as one, may be seen as fuzzy-minded, dangerous, or unpatriotic by others who have a much more traditional view of the world. Cultural nationalism or protectionism may seem an anachronism to many internationlists whose image of the world is dominated by the notion of a global village, but the practice is still widespread.

This issue manifests itself in many forms, none more explosive than in the context of national loyalties versus commitments to humanity more generally. Harold Lasswell, in a speech given at the 1968 NCSS convention, highlighted this issue. "All men are by birth human. They belong potentially to the nation of man. But at birth all men are absorbed into territorial and pluralistic groups whose members may deny the claim of the whole community to have the final word in conflicts among lesser entities." Identity, loyalty, obligations, responsibility, privileges, rights, and duties have long been associated with individual membership in various social groups — none of these affiliations are more demanding and more pervasive than those associated with nation. The terms global village, global society, and global perspective are widely used by internationalists today. Resistence to this view is widespread; many

people fear that the inculcation of "global" values — of a world view — will weaken us as a nation and expose us to manipulation by other nations whose perceived self-interests are different from ours.

This issue can, of course be put in the context of the controversy surrounding the teaching of values. In presenting a broad perspective from which we seek to understand the present and visualize the future, global education challenges many of the values and assumptions which undergird dominant educational patterns in the United States and the industrialized world. The question then includes not only what values should we teach (for those who favor the teaching of values) but the question of to what extent should values be dealt with at all.

Even among those who are favorably disposed toward a humankind perspective this issue poses a classical dilemma: "If I restrain myself in the interest of the common good, how do I know others will do so as well?" But neither innocence nor ignorance is likely to protect us from manipulation, which suggests we must seek out the international facts of life.

Another related question is: can we globalize our thinking without including people and perspectives from other areas of the world in the planning and implementing of proposed programs? Is the term meaningless if we limit our discussion to global education in our own national context? Can there be a truly global education movement of the magnitude required to meet the challenges of our global age without the involvement of millions of people the world over?

There is no universal language, no single global institution suitable to promote the global dimensions of education. How can the necessary networks, communication, and joint efforts be developed? Creating such institutions involves much more than merely extending existing national institutions. Where agreed-upon areas of international action exist in such fields as health, air traffic, or weather observation they have been negotiated specifically in absence of general policy.

In the United States, traditionally, learning about others who see the world differently has not been given the attention in our schools that American ideas and values have received. Many Americans' natural heritage is outside the United States. This seems to have created a situation in which we feel obligated to constantly repeat, recite, and reaffirm our U.S. heritage. This tradition may be weakening. Increasing emphasis on ethnicity is occurring, and it is upsetting to many who value cultural homogeneity. Increasing recognition of the importance of cultural diversity and differing personal roots is occurring. Ethnicity may, of course, merely produce "dual ethnocentrism," but in a broader context it makes diversity possible. Can global education offer a context within which peoples living in the 160-plus nations are seen as members of a single species with similar motives and feelings? Can such a concept help individuals see other nations not only as abstractions but as people very much like themselves? The proposed increase in the study of other languages may also help. Children who grow up hearing a second language and learning that there is always more than one way to say something or to interpret anything may be less likely as adults to think that any one way is necessarily superior. The importance of language, of the study of culture, of the systems approach which seems a natural in global education raises another question. Is it possible to conceptualize global education in a way that satisfies those whose major interest is multicultural, bilingual, or ethnic heritage education? How much unity, how much diversity, can and should global education promote?

The problems or issues that surround the global education movement are reflections of the conditions of our society. For in periods of transition educational planners must deal with competing images. In such circumstances a single dominant pattern is unlikely to emerge or be widely accepted. What coherence there is must come from approaches to the transformation of the present and the possibilities of the future.

James M. Becker is Director of International Studies in Schools at Indiana University.

Toward a Coherent Curriculum for Global Education

James M. Becker

A growing recognition that their lives and hopes for the future are increasingly linked to events and developments around the world has created a variety of responses from political leaders, educators, and ordinary citizens. The National Governors Association meeting in New York in December, 1987 called a global perspective a "key to prosperity." A report released in 1987 by a study commission made up of nationally known educators including Clark Kerr, President Emeritus, University of California; Harlan Cleveland, Dean, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs; and John I. Goodlad, Director, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, recommends a nationwide, intensive effort to improve and expand global education in the nation's schools.

The State of the World 1987, perhaps the most complete, up-to-date, readily available reference to the World's resources provides further evidence that effective citizenship today requires a global perspective.

The authors of this report note that hopes for meeting the needs of our society without diminishing the prospects of future generations can only be accomplished if a sufficient number of citizens understand and are concerned about global issues. They cite a dramatic increase in the scale of human activities and the resultant pressures on the Earth's resources as a challenge that can only be met by a well-informed citizenry with a global perspective.

In this article the author makes a case for improving and expanding the global dimensions of education, citing evidence presented in *The State of the World* along with the greater intermixing of peoples and cultures, and the changing role of the United States in world affairs, as conditions requiring new educational responses.

The author provides a context and a rationale and suggests some areas that need emphasis if U.S. citizens are to play effective roles in an increasingly interrelated world.

Increasing Population, Industrial Production, and Pressures on the Earth's Resources

The scale of human activities on planet Earth has changed drastically since 1950. Between 1950 and 1986 the number of human beings doubled. Per capita income also doubled. Within a single generation the global output of goods and services quadrupled. A great variety of technological developments contributed to the expansion, none more so than the growth of fossil fuel use. Between 1950 and 1986 world fossil fuel consumption increased four-fold paralleling the growth in the global economy.

The dramatic rise in human activity has increased pressures on the Earth's resources. To date, advancing technology and cheap energy seem to have overcome a growing concern about these developments. Nonetheless the negative side effects of this century's twenty-fold expansion of economic activity are beginning to surface. Chernobyl, acid rain, the energy crises, Bhopal, and other industrial disasters serve to remind us that the pursuit of economic growth without adequate protection of the environment exacts a high price. The question of how much global economic expansion the Earth's natural systems can sustain remains unanswered.

Lester Brown in *State of the World 1987*, notes that "a sustainable society satisfies its needs without diminishing the prospects of the next generation." Contemporary society may well fail to meet this criterion. Meeting the needs of today's inhabitants of planet Earth without diminishing the prospects of the next generation is unlikely to occur without considerable change worldwide

in the political and economic environment. Increasing the number of people who see clearly the relationship between industrial development, population growth, and environmental health is an essential element in hopes for creating a sustainable society. Government policies regarding these issues are likely to change only when informed and active citizens make known their concerns. Since there are global issues remedial efforts must be worldwide in scope.

Increasing Transnational and Intercultural Interactions

Advances in mass communications and transportation together with increases in population and wealth have brought about a greater intermixing of peoples and cultures than ever before. Today people, goods, information, and resources move freely across national boundaries. National economies have become so international that a leading Japanese industrialist comments: "The world has entered the age of . . . the borderless economy." The continuation of these developments — expanding transnational connections — guarantees even more widespread and increasing cross-cultural and cross-national contact . . . few individuals will escape being touched in some way by intercultural experience. Education designed to help children and youth participate in today's world must have an intercultural dimension. The importance of intercultural sensitivities among citizens of Western nations is apparent in the changing demographic patterns. In 1900 more than 30 percent of the world's population was in western nations, today it is 14 percent. It is estimated it will shrink to 9 percent by the year 2010. The current 5 billion world population is 18 percent white and declining.

Given the diversity of human experience, the challenges of international understanding are monumental. As yet, no universal history of human development has been written. There are many conflicting accounts of events from differing nationalistic and geographic perspectives. Reconciling these differing views has only begun to attract a sizeable number of historians. It is apparent that the type of history taught today will have to be drastically changed to prepare people for a world where all cultural groups are in contact. Newer broader more inclusive perspectives will be required. New myths and new symbols to help extend our loyalties to the entire human race and to planet Earth as our common home are needed.

The Changing Role of the U.S. in World Affairs

The decades following World War II are often cited as the "golden age" of American power and influence in the world. By 1950 the United States produced one-third of the world's exports. Until the late 1960s the U.S. nuclear superiority was seen as the free world's ultimate security guarantee. The United States had a network of political and military alliances encircling the Soviet Union and China. The United States aided and abetted an economic order featuring free trade and fixed exchange rates. Large-scale economic and military aid was used to strengthen underdeveloped countries against leftist ideologies. It also provided an outlet for United States manufacturers and surplus food.The Peace Corp, the Fulbright Exchange Programs, the United States Information Agency, and the U.S. Foreign Service helped to create a positive image abroad.

United States involvement in the Vietnam War ended the post World War II consensus on foreign policy. Congressional involvement in foreign policy challenged the president's role. Lobby and pressure groups burgeoned. At the same time distinctions between domestic and foreign issues became blurred.

Changes in the making of U.S. foreign policy were accompanied by several developments abroad that added to a relative decline of U.S. power in the world. The international political and economic environment changed drastically between 1950 and 1980. The number of nations in the world more than doubled. The Soviet Union engaged in a massive military buildup and the bipolar world of the two superpowers was replaced by a multipolar one with Japan, China, and Western Europe as important actors. In fact by the late 1980s Japan's growing economic strength seems to be dislodging the United States as the dominant economic power in the free world. The transition from U.S. post-war dominance to some new alignment creates unusual challenges to a nation accustomed to considering itself number one.

New Challenges for U.S. Citizens

Governments are unlikely to change present policies without pressure from the people. For people to respond to these changing conditions — to today's global challenges such as cross-cultural tensions, economic and environmental threats, and changing political power relationships — they must cross what Harvard University Professor Harvey Brooke calls "perceptual thresholds." That is, enough people must see the situation or threat for a cogent response to occur. Information, knowledge, and understanding are the keys to crossing such thresholds. Until public concern is manifest it is unlikely any action will occur. The information and concern that undergirds change may come in dramatic form such as the nuclear power accidents at Three Mile Island or Chernobyl or the energy crises of the 1970s. But such events are likely to result in effective, desirable action only when our citizens are prepared to see them in a global context. Even more crucial is the need for political leaders to see our predicament in a broad historical context. The cry today for more emphasis on the traditional, narrow, nationalistic U.S. and western-oriented history seems especially misplaced. Paul Kennedy Dilworth, Yale University Professor of History, in his widely proclaimed, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* states: "You only properly understand your own country when you remove the ethnocentric spectacles, examine the history of other countries, and put your own nation within the larger context of global developments." Studying U.S. history as part of the

world's history requires a global perspective.

Today worldwide interdependencies affect the quality of the air we breathe and the water we drink; the price of gasoline, sugar, coffee, and many other products we buy; our tax level; the size of our armed forces; the level of employment and inflation; to say nothing of our hopes for the future. Internationalization is occurring in all dimensions of culture in technologies, institutions, languages, and beliefs.

We can no longer isolate ourselves from the world — to act unilaterally — without suffering what Harvard political economist Robert Reich calls the boomerang effect. Our way of life is shaped by and dependent upon a $50 trillion annual flow of global capital, a $2 trillion current of trade and investment in goods and services, a vast sea of information and technology, and a swirl of political forces emanating from every region on earth.

Unilaterally getting our way is no longer possible. There are now several other nations who are as productive as we are, as competitive in world markets, and potentially as deadly. Enmeshed in a global system that has no clear boundaries our actions reverberate through this system and to our consternation bounce back. The boomerang principle takes effect when one actor in an interdependent system attempts to act unilaterally, in ignorance or defiance of other actors in the system.

The transition from a position of dominance to one of sharing with other nations much of the power and influence we once assumed was ours creates a critical need to reassess what we, the citizens of the world's oldest republic, need to know about the world and our role in it.

Citizen Education in a Global Age

The increasing internationalization of society and interdependence among peoples and nations makes it imperative that citizenship education — a traditional and essential component of education in the United States — have a global dimension. Accelerating global interdependence places additional demands on our citizens. For example, the subtle connections which link an individual's daily life with global systems provide new opportunities to learn about and participate in world affairs and renew knowledge, new skills, and new sensitivities.

Increasingly, it is necessary for U.S. citizens to embrace simultaneously a local, national, and global perspective. The ability of the United States to provide leadership in our rapidly changing world depends upon the attitudes and behavior of the general citizenry. The public's values and perceptions place limits on and help define the actions of political leaders. Thus, it makes a difference whether the public believes:

- that resources are unlimited and we can continue to consume at an increasing rate or that we must develop new lifestyles that place less demand on non-renewable resources.
- that is world is divided into warring camps of "good guys" and "bad guys" or that nations can differ without trying to destroy one another.
- that foreigners are peculiar or that cultural diversity is the norm and enriches human experience The need for more public understanding and discussion of these issues is apparent.

The schools, the one institution which reaches most citizens, play a crucial role in such efforts. Teaching for a global perspective involves much of what has traditionally been taught in the social studies: the study of families around the world, world geography, world history and cultures, and international organizations, processes, and developments. More, however, is required if students are to understand how the world works. The implications of the increased scope of human interaction on planet Earth must be given more attention. We cannot merely add to traditional social studies, Asian studies, women's studies, or environmental concerns. Rather we need to rethink, to interpret human interactions in a larger context including a wider range of human experience. The history and conditions of all human beings and cultures — not just male heroes, wars, and western civilization — must become the focus of our attention.

What images of the world and the way the world works are reinforced or challenged by what happens in classrooms across the country today? We all have images of other nations and peoples as well as of international events and processes. In some cases these are based on experience, study, and empathetic understanding. Images can also be simplistic, inaccurate, and unkind.

The danger of simplistic notions of peoples and cultures is recognized in the preamble to the constitution of UNESCO which states, "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that defenses of peace must be constructed." Judging by the violence and tension in today's world one can only conclude that the number of people with a rich, positive, hopeful image of the world is far too small.

Some Suggested Areas of Emphasis

Harlan Cleveland suggests today's children are part of a new manifest destiny, less assertive and pretentious, yet worldwide in its scope of action. He argues that a feel for world affairs is a requirement for U.S. citizenship. Noting that the facts that children learn in school are unlikely to be true for as long as it takes them to grow up, he believes they are better off to develop a durable feel for:

- Their own basic human needs, and therefore the needs and aspirations of people everywhere.
- The interrelated global changes that will provide most of the context for their 50-plus years of adult life.
- The limited usefulness of violence and the widening dimensions of "national security."
- The rolling global readjustment in what people produce and consume and do for a living, which will affect the jobs and careers of each grown-up child.
- The lesson from history that it is often possible for people, and

peoples, to resolve conflicts and work together.

- The cultural diversity and mandatory pluralism of a world with nobody in charge — and therefore everybody partly in charge.
- The nature of leadership in such a world — since whatever the issue, the United States is bound to be elected to the global executive committee that must deal with it.

In the *United States Prepares For Its Future: Global Perspectives in Education*, four themes are identified as basic to the development of a global perspective. They are:

1. Understanding the interdependent nature of the world in terms of its physical, biological, economic, political, and communication systems. Drawing largely on the work of Kenneth Boulding, the Commission suggests that relationships such as the impact of the burgeoning human population and increased industrialization on the Earth's non-renewable resources and on political and economic choices and consequences is at the heart of global education.
2. Knowledge of the development of the world's major civilizations. A historical perspective that enables students to place themselves in a temporal sequence that has a future as well as a past is seen by the Commission as an important element of a global perspective.
3. Understanding one's own and other cultures. The Commission advocates that students study their own and other cultures in order to better understand and appreciate the diversity of values and cultural systems found around the world.
4. Preparation for public policy decision-making. High priority is given to preparation for citizenship — "students should actively engage in analytical and creative thinking . . . sharpening their ability to recognize concepts, problems, and issues, to define them, to identify information needs, to analyze alternative solutions, to calculate costs and benefits and to make responsible public choices. The Commission makes a clear distinction between public judgement and public opinion. They maintain that opinions often suggest lack of information, forethought, or serious consideration, while public judgement arises only after people have been exposed to the arguments for and against various positions and have thought deeply enough about the issues to accept the consequences of their beliefs. A major purpose of global education is to create a context and provide information needed to help citizens make intelligent choices about public policy issues in an increasingly interdependent world.

Though a coherent conceptual framework has not yet been devised, some possible models have been proposed and some exciting teaching materials and strategies have been developed. The increasing number of statements, programs and instructional materials promoting global education attest to its growing importance in our professional priorities.*

*See *Global Resources: Teaching about global education. ERIC, SSDC, 2805 East 10th Street Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, for an up-to-date list of organizations, reports, and materials.*

James M. Becker is Director of International Studies in Schools, Indiana University.

The Challenges Facing Global Education

Devon J. Metzger

It is well known that our school-age children are globally illiterate. Surveys consistently find that our youth know little about their world — and what they do know is often distorted. "What the United States does best is to understand itself. What is does worst is to understand others." (Lubeck 1988). Sadly, this self-centered perspective contradicts reality. We are a nation existing in an interdependent world, and a nation uninformed about its partners. Nevertheless, it seems a safe assumption that most of the readers of this article prefer that our youth approach full-fledged citizenship with an international and/or global perspective. Furthermore, it seems likely that a very large majority of social studies educators in this country equally subscribe to this preference. Why, then, does international understanding and global awareness, widely accepted as an important and valued social education goal, have such a difficult entry into the social studies classroom? The reasons are many and varied. The following discussion will offer some insight into the expected challenges facing global education in our social studies classroom?

Perhaps one of the more obvious barriers to including global education in our social studies classrooms are the teachers themselves. Teachers, like American citizens in general, are not well-informed about world issues and cultures and the realities of global interdependence. Furthermore, although social studies teachers have had at least one world history course (usually a history of the Western world), it is unlikely that their teacher preparation program offered any courses or experiences that would assist them in developing an authentic global perspective. Consequently, teachers who are knowledgeable, aware, and open to a global view do not often have the skills and training to systematically teach a global perspective. For less enlightened teachers, the lack of knowledge and training can result in educational malpractice; that is, the teaching of inaccuracies, myths, and distortions detrimental to international understanding and perpetuating the cycle of global ignorance. Even if teacher education programs were to make the necessary changes in their curricula to correct this oversight, the challenge of educating currently practicing teachers would remain. In other words, in addition to needed changes in teacher preparation programs, staff development and in-service training is needed for educators who are presently teaching.

Another barrier to including global education in the social studies classroom is the quality of teacher instruction. The very nature of global education mandates that conflicting ideas and concerns be introduced, investigated, and debated within the context of higher-level learning. According to Goodlad (1986), this approach to instruction is unlikely to happen: "the dominant methods of classrooms — lecturing, telling, questioning by teachers, and passive listening and perfunctory performance by students — simply do not provide for student involvement in either an intellectual dialogue or other activities requiring high-level cognitive functioning." Dealing with conflict and confronting opposing positions in the social studies classroom is more easily avoided than conscientiously planned for and pursued. It is simply easier to present an unopposed viewpoint, especially if it is a safe position and/or a position espoused by the teacher. The larger community may also hold values that discourage the teaching of controversial issues, and teaching a global perspective can present issues and ideas that conflict with the parochial views of the local community.

For teachers of younger students, controversial issues are sometimes avoided because there are often no simple solutions and children may be required to confront grim or disturbing realities

(Snow, March, and Burt 1985). There are clearly ways to avoid unnecessary student fear or worry, but educators and parents may prove uncomfortable with upsetting youthful idealism. Nevertheless, teachers often do not have the training to properly teach controversial issues and viewpoints. Expanding instructional approaches to include the process of open discussion and free inquiry requires a teacher who is comfortable with tentativeness and who has learned the important attributes and appropriate structure that is integral to active student investigation and learning.

A third barrier discouraging the inclusion of global education in the social studies classroom is curriculum rigidity. Whether more real or imagined, most teachers feel tightly bound by a state, district, school, and/or department curriculum. There is no questioning that the school programs are crowded, and it is equally certain that mandated curricula exist and are imposing. Attempting to make room for global education in the curriculum schedule is a difficult, sometimes impossible task. An alternative approach, and an approach recommended by most global educators, is to integrate global ideas and concepts into the prescribed curriculum. Teachers who are aware and knowledgeable about the complexities of the global system *can* integrate a global perspective into the social studies curriculum. It is discouraging to know, however, that "studies of schools reveal relatively little attention to the political, economic, and belief systems of other countries, to say nothing of world systems." (Goodlad 1986). The responsibility for change, therefore, reverts back to properly educated and trained teachers, teachers who are prepared to integrate a global perspective into the school curriculum.

A fourth barrier to pursuing global education is considered by some to be the most insidious barrier. For many teachers, the omniscient textbook dictates what will or will not be taught. Unfortunately, teacher textbook addiction can translate into student learning that mitigates the importance and distorts the reality of global interdependence. Although some textbooks consciously avoid ethnocentricism and give systematic attention to international awareness and understanding, many textbooks do not get passing marks. Twenty years ago, as a beginning teacher, I was given my first history textbook. While I cannot remember the text, I have not forgotten the titles of two chapters. One was entitled, "Canada: Understanding Our Friendly Neighbors to the North." A second chapter was called, "Mexico: Helping Our Poor Neighbors to the South." Most textbooks are no longer as overt with their bias, but they may be no less harmful. Subtle messages that reflect cultural stereotypes and narrow political perspectives can escape even the most globally aware teachers. For example, a recent study (Anderson and Beck 1983) investigating children's books and textbooks and their view of Central America, concluded that, ". . . children's books and learning materials included in this study have students poorly prepared to understand events in Central America, confused about the countries and governments there, and alienated from Central American people and their culture."

To perpetuate a global perspective, it will be necessary for teachers to become acutely aware of textbook bias (perhaps even use textbooks bias to investigate attitudes alien to international understanding), and to broaden curriculum and instruction materials to include readings and experiences that foster global awareness and understanding. "Until recently, textbook publishers were unwilling to produce texts or supplementary materials which included global topics." (Smith 1988). Now, more and more global education materials are becoming available to our schools, but inadequate material resources, due to underfunded project centers, continue to provide a level of frustration to educators ready to incorporate global education in their social studies classrooms. As the global education network is expanded, and as more materials are developed and shared, the opportunity to teach a global perspective should become a more manageable challenge.

A fifth barrier has less to do with the school and more to do with the individual student. Both the individual attitudes that are brought to school and the developmental learning process can provide barriers to successfully teaching global awareness if they are not properly understood and considered. Torney (1979) identifies four types of "within-individual" obstacles that can frustrate efforts toward developing a global perspective: cognitive, attitudinal, personal, and communication barriers. Although Torney discusses each of the four obstacles at length, a brief discussion will follow here.

It seems the period of middle childhood, usually around the age of 11, offers the optimum time for students to more willingly learn about and accept people who are different than themselves. Before this relative age, comprehension is more difficult, and after this age — around age 14 — adolescent attitudes become less pliable. Consequently, when students have not been given the formal opportunity to develop a global perspective by the time they enter high school, the challenge obviously becomes more difficult.

Another obstacle concerns the students' international socialization. Students at a young age develop a strong sense of nationalism. Certainly a positive national attachment is desirable, yet a very strong attachment can interfere with understanding and appreciating diversity and can contribute to a good/bad view of the world's nations and people. Elementary students especially need careful assistance in comprehending our pluralistic and global system.

Personal and motivational obstacles include three similar concerns. The first concern is with self-esteem. It is widely known that a positive self-esteem is important to an individual's growth and development. However, individuals with a very high self-esteem may tend to look upon others as inferior. Likewise, the same individual may hold his or her nation at an unrealistically high chauvinistic level, and therefore see other peoples and nations as inferior. Rogers (1980) has suggested that teachers encourage students to perceive their country as "most dear" to them, rather than their country as "number one." This change in perspective helps to eliminate the unnecessary ranking of nations and

peoples.

Another concern is the need of some students for sameness, and the need of others for novelty and diversity. It is suggested that determining the different needs of students can be important to how a teacher approaches planned intercultural lessons and experiences. A similar diagnostic process involves a third concern. Deciding whether a student is basically active or passive can help a teacher select appropriate global education activities and experiences. Understandably, active students seem more easily involved in global education activities and experiences.

Still another concern is the spoken language. Children, more than adolescents, stress language as the major reason for national differences. Language awareness can easily foster ethnocentrism if the perception is that the way a child speaks is the "normal" way to speak. It is critical that the early years of education include integrated cultural and language study. If this does not happen, language, as a socialization mode, can become an obstacle to global understanding.

A sixth barrier to the acceptance of global studies in the curriculum involves the mass media, which are major socialization factors in the lives of students outside of school. The media, especially television, too often present glaring and distorted stereotypes of nations and people different from our own. Movies also contribute to misperceptions and negative stereotypes, and newspapers and magazines can cause students to simplify otherwise complex international issues. Furthermore, given the sensational approach of the news media, students often perceive the international society as hostile, explosive, and full of catastrophe. If social studies educators are serious about teaching a global perspective, it is imperative that attention be given to helping students become intelligent and critical media consumers.

A seventh "potential" barrier is represented by the seriously debated controversies surrounding the existence of global education as a now maturing subject of study. Global education has come under the expected scrutiny due a subject of study that has gained a very small, but firm foothold in American education over the last 20 years. Not unlike the recent emergence of women's studies, there comes a time when even the founders and friends of an emerging field of study are required to take a hard look at what they have become, carefully critiquing their purpose and direction, identifying misguided intentions and questionable materials, and confronting serious criticism and public opinion. There are essentially four issues of controversy that deserve both our attention and eventual resolution if they are to avoid becoming real barriers to including global education in the social studies classroom.

The first criticism claims that global education has the potential to compete with and therefore weaken the fundamental or traditional social studies curriculum. The critics contend that introducing global education into the social studies classroom will ultimately serve to keep Americans ignorant about their own history, culture, and traditions. A second criticism charges that global education cannot be considered a serious subject of study. The critics judge global education as formless and without substance, an interest that is more process and attitude than content or defined discipline. A third criticism is the most popular among global education critics. Conservatives, primarily, claim that global education endangers our national security. By introducing the concepts of spaceship Earth, global village, and world citizenship, we are also introducing concepts damaging to nationalism, and thus eroding our shared national identity and common culture. A fourth criticism points to moral relativism as a concomitant ally of global education. The critics perceive the teaching and development of a global perspective as also blurring the boundaries between nations and ideologies, boundaries that offer dramatic and distinctive differences, differences that have everything to do with decisions about human dignity, social justice, freedom, and repression. To reiterate, these four criticisms must be carefully weighed and considered, and ultimately resolved to avoid becoming barriers to global education.

In conclusion, it is important to restate the essential purpose of this article: understanding the barriers to teaching global education is to increase the opportunity for overcoming the barriers. Although the challenges can sometimes be difficult and frustrating, they need not be insurmountable. The social studies teacher who believes in and is committed to the purpose and goals of global education *can* present an international perspective in the social studies classroom and systematically integrate global education concepts into the formal social studies curriculum. Teachers must also become more aware of their own world view, become knowledgeable about complex global realities, and broaden their instructional approaches to include more challenging levels of learning. Equally important is the critical task of soliciting textbooks and curriculum materials that reflect an accurate and unbiased global view. Furthermore, global education can become a part of the everyday social studies classroom by integrating important global education concepts into the curriculum rather than competing with an already overcrowded and established curricula. Teachers can also enhance the chances of students being more receptive to global education by diagnosing individual learning needs, learning styles, and developmental stages. In addition, teachers must be sensitive to influential forces outside of the school, and offer counter-socialization experiences that help students balance opinion and become intelligently aware of media simplicity and bias. Lastly, educators in general must rationally consider and solve the criticisms that face global education.

The importance of helping students learn about their interdependent world cannot be underestimated. Each new generation of youths becomes inexorably more involved in a shrinking world and a more complex international society. It is imperative that our students develop and achieve some sense of their global citizenship. There is simply no other choice if global survival is the decision.

References

Anderson, Nancy and Beck, Rochelle. 1983. "Central America by the Book, What Children are Learning?" *Social Education*. 47(2): 109.

Goodlad, John I. 1986. "The Learner at the World's Center." *Social Education*, 50(6): 433 and 430.

Lubeck Dennis. 1988. "Out of sight, out of mind.". *St. Louis Dispatch*. May 12:3B.

Rogers, Vincent. 1980. "Teachers, Show America as it is!" *Learning*, October: 34:31-35.

Smith, Andrew F. 1988. "The State of Global Education." *Access*, 79:9-13.

Snow, Roberta, Mack, John E., and Burt, Lucile. 1985. "Teaching About Human Conflict: What are the Possibilities?" *Social Education*, 49(6): 488.

Torney, Judith V. 1979. "Psychological and Institutional Obstacles to the Global Perspective in Education." *Schooling for a Global Age*, Becker, James M., ed., McGraw Hill: 59-93.

Devon J. Metzger is an associate professor in the Department of Education at California State University, Chico.

Is It A System?: Building a Global Perspective in the Elementary and Middle Grades

Ann V. Angell

Helping students think about their world as a system may be an important key to the development of global understanding. Systems thinking uses the concepts of interaction and interdependence to explain how the components of a complex situation function together, producing effects which none could produce alone. Because the structures and functions of a system are interdependent, change in any part of a system affects all of the other parts, as well as the whole. Recognizing that the components of a system are systems in themselves, and that each system is part of a larger system, increases an awareness of the complexity of the world. Systems thinking helps students conceptualize the intricate web of cause/effect relationships which exists on our planet. As a result, they are better equipped to understand the global consequences of changes in natural phenomena and human activity.

In 1979, Robert G. Hanvey proposed five dimensions of an attainable global perspective. Three of them suggest the appropriateness of instructional strategies which encourage systems thinking. Both *state-of-the-planet awareness* and *knowledge of global dynamics* require a notion of how the world works: a model of the complexity and interdependence which characterize the relationships operating on the planet. An *awareness of human choices* depends on understanding the complexity of cause/effect relationships as well as recognizing the role that people play in the global system.

At a recent workshop on global education, Dr. Bill Foege, a distinguished world health professional and executive director of the Carter Center of Emory University, implied the need for systems thinking when he urged teachers to:

> "Teach children that they are global citizens and how they fit into the world. We live in a world where everything affects everything else. Teach children it is possible to plan a rational future. They need curiosity so they will continue to learn, and knowledge that this is a cause-and-effect world . . ."

The following lesson, *Is it a system?*, is an adaptation of a systems lesson designed for 7th to 12th graders by Dr. Cheryl Pagan at Heifer Project International. In an effort to make systems thinking accessible to elementary students, the current adaptation begins by considering two systems which are familiar to this age group: the stereo system and the human body system. These examples serve as models which are explored to identify characteristics of systems. Finally, Pagan's forced-choice word association games sets the stage for considering global phenomena from a systems perspective. The teacher's script for *Is it a system?* targets 3rd to 6th graders, but the activities lend themselves to further adaptation for other groups.

Is it a System?

Suggested Grade Level: 3-6

Purpose: To help students develop a model for understanding systems and an awareness of their world as a global system.

Objectives:

1. Students will describe characteristics of systems.
2. Students will practice fluent and flexible thinking to create forced associations between given words.
3. Students will generalize that a change in any part of a system affects all of the other parts, as well as the whole.
4. Students will describe relationships between various global phenomena.

5. Students will hypothesize about the consequences of change in the global system.

Materials:

1. Several large index cards and a marker.
2. Set of rectangular signs, each one labeled with the name of one component of the human body system: *heart and blood vessels, skeleton, brain and nerves, muscles, digestion organs, the senses, lungs*. To encourage recognition of sub-systems, write the name of the sub-system which each component represents on the reverse side of the sign, i.e., circulatory system, skeletal system, nervous system, muscle system, digestive system, sensory system, and respiratory system. (Signs should be made out of poster board or other fairly rigid cardstock and should measure 4" by 14". Yarn or twine can be attached so that they can be worn around the neck.)
3. Set of similar signs (without neck loops) labeled with the following words: *land, livestock, people, food, air, water, transportation, money, government, culture*. Strips of construction paper (a different color for each sign), glued to both ends of each sign, will help students remember the relationships that are established in each exercise.
4. A few additional signs naming global phenomena (e.g., *famine, ozone depletion, war*) which are relevant to current events or other class activities, to focus the discussion of change in the global system. (These can be simple folded sheets of paper which fit easily over the more rigid poster board signs.)

Prerequisite Learning: Students should already have been introduced to the concepts of transportation, government, and culture; they should also be familiar with the vocabulary words that are used to describe the human body system.

Suggested Procedure (Teacher's script printed in bold):

The Stereo System

1. Teacher solicits names for components of a stereo system from the class: How many of you are familiar with a stereo system? What are the components of a stereo system?
2. As students give answers (speakers, turntable, receiver, amplifier, compact disk player, tape player, headphones), the teacher writes the component name on a large index card and gives it to the student.
3. When five or six components have been mentioned, invite the students with cards to demonstrate how the components of the stereo system are connected, by forming a human sculpture: Let's see if we can form a human sculpture (picture) to show how the components of a stereo system are connected. Which component should we start with? Which component is attached to it? (Students come forward one at a time and connect themselves with those components to which they are related.)
4. Teacher asks: When all of the components are hooked up and working properly, what do they do together?
5. Teacher asks one component to step out of the sculpture, i.e., "the speakers," and asks: What would happen if we took the speakers out of the system? What if we took the tape deck out?

The Human Body System

1. Teacher introduced the placards that name the components of the human body system: Here are some components of another system — the human body. Can you guess what they are? Who will volunteer to show us how the components of this system connect?
2. Teacher invites volunteers to wear a sign and come forward to illustrate the system as a circle: Let's show this system as a circle by hooking arms with components that are related to you. What do these components do when they are all connected and working together?
3. Teacher asks: Are there other ways this circle could be connected? Who would be affected if we eliminated the lung?, etc.
4. Teacher solicits definition of a system from students: What have we learned about a system from looking at these two examples? How can we describe a system? (A systems has many parts that work together. All the parts, or components, of a system are related to each other. Removing or changing any part of a system affects all the other parts.)
5. Teacher directs attention to the words on reverse side of signs: What do these words tell us about the components of systems? (Components of a system are also systems in themselves). These are called sub-systems.

Another System

1. Teacher asks for 10 volunteers to assemble in a circle to demonstrate another system. After students have formed a circle, teacher passes out second set of signs which they hold in front of them: These words are components of another system which we can represent as a circle.
2. Teacher asks students to describe how their word is related to the word next to them (clockwise in the circle), by saying: "_____ is connected to _____ because . . ."
3. When all students have taken turns around the circle explaining their relationship to their neighbor, have one student step out of the circle and ask: When "air" is removed from the system, how many of you are affected?
4. Help students compare this circle to the previous systems: How does this set of components fit our definition of a system? What could we call this system?
5. Ask the group: Is this the only way that the components in our system could be connected? Assemble a second group of students in a circle and redistribute the same signs in a different order. Ask a different component to drop out this time and discuss the effects.

At another time, redistribute the signs for "Another System"

and repeat the forced word association game. Replace one of the signs with a related global phenomenon sign (e.g., *famine* could replace *food*, *ozone depletion* could replace *air*, and *war* could replace *transportation*. Discuss the effects.

As a follow-up activity, the list of words for "Another System" can be printed on strips of colored paper corresponding to the colors on the lesson signs. Students can represent the relationships by assembling the strips as a paper chain. As an alternative, provide blank-colored paper strips so that students can create their own systems.

References

Foege, W. (Fall 1987) Address delivered at workshop on global education, co-sponsored by INSA (International Service Association for Health, Inc.) and the Carter Center of Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.

Hanvey R.G. (1979) *An Attainable Global Perspective*. New York: Global Perspectives, Inc.

Pagan, C. (1987). *Systems*. Little Rock, AR: Heifer Project International.

Ann V. Angell works in the Division of Educational Studies at Emory University.

A Mock U.N. Game: Teaching Global Awareness

Joe Regenbogen

As the bell rang, students ambled into the spacious library. Some were eager to begin, but most were still bleary eyed from the two hours of lecture given by the three professors of political science at the local university. At the start of the day, the 120 sophomores at the suburban high school had been told that the lectures were necessary to provide the background information on three resolutions that would form the nucleus of today's simulation. From this point on, the library would become the United Nations and the students would represent 20 nations that had recently been researched. Thus began another attempt on my part to raise the level of the students' global awareness.

It is no secret that students around the nation are practically illiterate in the area of international studies. Numerous surveys demonstrate this tragic fact. Out of curiosity, I gave my own quiz to 40 seniors. The results were as expected. Like their peers around the nation, my students are not learning enough to adequately become global citizens in the 21st century. While they recognize that the United States is being overtaken on the economic front (78 percent picked the United States as the world's largest debtor nation), 85 percent felt that there should be tighter restrictions placed on the number of immigrants allowed into the United States each year. Since my world history classes clearly needed a major activity that would combat their ignorance on international affairs, a mock United Nations appeared a promising way to achieve several objectives simultaneously.

I had first called the United Nations for a copy of the "Resolutions and Decisions Adopted by the General Assembly During the First Part of Its Forty Second Session." Then I devised a simulation game in which points were to be assigned to 20 nation teams according to the success that each team had in putting together majority coalitions and how closely each could match the vote actually cast by the nation represented. Three resolutions were selected so that 10 of the nations had voted in favor and 10 against their adoptions. As students began to research their nation in the days leading up to the simulation, a few of the students had become almost obssessed with finding out how each nation had voted. Several students actually called the United Nations and several other students contacted their nation's embassy in Washington D.C. As the game day approached, it was rewarding to see students taking charge of their own education.

For the world history teacher, a major obstacle to pursuing the U.N. mock simulation lies in the typical requirement of "covering" the text in only nine months. When the state curriculum guide requires units that stretch from pre-historic times to the present, global awareness is often ignored to the point of nonexistence. It is, however, possible to utilize global awareness as a vehicle for the curriculum, one involving a variety of "hands on" activities. The essential content is still studied and tested each week, but the remainder of the time is given to seminar discussions, research projects, debates, role playing, small group work, mock trials, speakers, field trips, and films. For example, a unit on the Mesoptamia could include research on the Iran-Iraq conflict culminating in a debate on the American involvement in the Persian Gulf. If "imperialism" were the topic of study, the film *Ghandi* could be used as a conduit to a variety of discussions and essays on cultural relativism. Most of the activities can be arranged to reinforce the traditional content, but they can also help break down ethnocentric attitudes, raise the level of motivation, and provide experiences that will be remembered long after the dates memorized have been forgotten.

The student who was elected as the U.N.'s Secretary General began round one with a short explanantion of the proposed resolution under consideration. After the types of sanctions that were to be directed at South Africa's system of Apartheid were reviewed, five minutes were allocated for general discussion. A couple of students tentatively stood up, identified their nations, and made some general statements. The Secretary General then explained that one student from each nation would have four minutes to move about and negotiate. Students were more lively during this period, but in two subsequent rounds, it became increasingly evident that every nation was going to vote yes on the resolution. When the written ballots were turned in and counted, the vote was a unanimous verdict. How could this happen? And why had the general discussion been so dead? Fortunately, the lunch period followed and some immediate changes could be made.

While world history may be the most likely course for the integration of global studies, it does not and should not have the global education monopoly. Indeed, other subjects of the social studies, not as loaded with the enormous content burden found in world history, integrate quite smoothly with global studies. U.S. history, for example, could easily accommodate units comparing the American Revolution to the French, Russian, Chinese, and Cuban Revolutions. Government courses could include units on comparative politics and international relations. Subjects like geography, sociology, economics, and anthropology are loaded with obvious possibilities for interesting global issues and concerns. The actual development of units involving global studies requires considerable personal and professional commitment, as well as a willingness to make the appropriate tradeoffs in the coverage of traditional content. The arms race can be linked with the causes of World War I, and the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan can be compared to the Vietnam War, but this does require a great deal of additional effort on the part of teachers who are often already overworked.

During lunch, it was decided that the General Assembly's open discussion should follow several rounds of negotiations rather than precede them. More importantly, the focus of the scoring needed an immediate change. Instead of rewarding a team with six points for voting with the majority and deducting two points for voting on the losing side, these numbers were reduced to four and one respectively. However, if a team could match the actual vote of their nation, which was to be announced immediately after the team's vote was recorded, the points received would be increased from four to six (and from one to two for a mismatch). These changes contributed to the improved functioning of the simulation game. Being flexible is an important ingredient in the successful implementation of a simulation or any other activity dependent on students taking an active, decision-making role.

In the past couple of years, I have been fortunate to work in a social studies department that includes teachers who are as determined as I to enhance the global studies component of the school's curriculum. Together we have been able to develop schoolwide programs each year that substantially enhance the study of globalism in general. These programs have included international fairs, global issues forums, and mock United Nations. While the cooperation of the school's administration is essential, most of the organization and planning has been carried out by student committees. These committees have invited guest lecturers, led discussion groups, researched and written background materials, and created the necessary materials. While "extra credit" is an effective motivator, the more time the students invest in the development of their own program, the more satisfaction they derive.

During the final two periods allocated to the simulation game, resolutions on support for the Palestinians and a nuclear freeze were negotiated, debated, and voted on. By the second round, the volume of debate had reached a level where students had to be quieted in order not to disturb neighboring classes. The distribution of votes had become more even. In the third round the debate reached that rare but magical moment when the students became so passionately involved in what they were saying and hearing that they never even saw the broad smiles on the faces of their teachers. By the end, the "General Assembly" ballotted to support a nuclear freeze by a vote of eleven to nine. Scores were later tabulated and three teams had tied for the win, but by that point, everyone seemed to recognize that what had happened went far beyond the scope of an ordinary, competitive game.

If you would like copies of the handouts used for the United Nations Game send a self-addressed, stamped envelope to: 1722 Featherwood Dr., St. Louis, MO. 6314.

Joe Regenbogen is a teacher in the St. Louis Public Schools.

Global Peace Begins in Our Classrooms

Katherine London

> "Establishing a lasting peace is the work of education; all politics can do is keep us out of war."
>
> Maria Montessori, 1932

Introduction

Establishing a lasting peace is a global task that must begin on the level of each individual. The people and nations of the world have become so interdependent that war in one part of the world will inevitably have impact on peace in another part of the world. Only by completely changing the way in which we think about war, peace, and one another — by waging peace instead of war among individuals and among nations — may we learn to cooperate and to survive. Peace, to be lasting, must be worldwide.

The effort to build a lasting peace will require thinking about the world and its people in a way very different from that of our predecessors. We and our children must reach a clear understanding of what it means to have peace, both individually and collectively. We need to internalize the interconnectedness of all life on earth and work toward cooperation for our common good. We need to learn to recognize the characteristics of a peacemaker and to discover how we can be peacemakers every day. We need a mental picture of a peaceful world in the future along with the belief that our actions can help to achieve the goal of making that vision a reality.

While many educators recognize the usefulness of studying about peace, they are perplexed about how to actually teach it. Not only is it unlikely that they have studied "peace," but for many people, the subject is immediately associated with nuclear weapons and nuclear war, which can be very confusing issues to discuss without proper introduction. Our school studies tend to be caught up in issues of defense and environmental protection, while peace is hardly given any attention.

It is useful to make a distinction between a curriculum that teaches, say, about nuclear issues and the devastations of nuclear war, and one that seeks to teach students positive attitudes and methods for building peace. The latter can involve students actively at the personal, local, and even regional levels, while the former must necessarily be passive and negative. Once students have developed a meaningful understanding of peace and peacemaking on an individual and community level, they are better prepared to deal with the impact of nuclear issues on peace in the global community. The study of peacemaking at a local and individual level is a first stage for the study of peace as a global concept.

Many teachers may feel that there is simply no time in their crowded curriculum to present yet another topic of study. It is possible, however, to superimpose the study of peace over the established curriculum by including it in the study of various aspects of language, literature, and social studies. This article will suggest a conceptual framework and give some examples of activities around which a teacher may devise a plan for including instruction in his or her own classroom which will promote an understanding of what it takes to build peace.

The Concepts of Building for Peace

One may think of teaching for peace as involving a hierarchy of instructional methods in which students move from thinking peace in distant, abstract terms to realizing that they have important roles in building a more peaceful world. Engaging students in the definition of such concepts as "peace" and "peacemaker,"

having them deal with the nature and potential benefits of cooperation and conflict resolution, and finding opportunities for them to take actions that achieve changes toward a more peaceful existence *within their own sphere of influence* comprise an initial approach to the study of peace. The primary objective would be to develop in students confidence in their own abilities to contribute to the establishment of a lasting peace.

The initial level in teaching about concepts of peace involves helping students to develop their own definition of "peace." For most people, the image that first comes to mind in response to the word "peace" is simply "an absence of war." An extension of this may be peace and quiet, inner peace, or even peaceful sleep. This is essentially a passive conception; and when compared to the exciting images of action in tales of daring heroism, courage, and glory associated with war, peace may even seem rather boring.

This simplistic, passive connotation is not enough; we need to help students develop a concept of peace as a dynamic force. They must learn to recognize times when they are experiencing peace in cooperative activity with others as well as within themselves. Their definition of peace has to be able to include the activities they personally engage in to achieve and maintain peace in their own lives. Once they have a personal understanding of what action-based peace is in their own lives, they can begin to explore what it means to have peace in the community and on a global scale between people and between nations. In doing so, it is appropriate for them to also acknowledge the relationship between humans and the natural environment as an important component of peace.

Beyond revising their definition of the abstract concept of peace, we cannot really expect young students to easily envision what peace between nations means when they experience intimidation and violence daily in their own cities and neighborhoods and on the playground at school. Action for peace must begin at the level of individuals trying to settle differences and work cooperatively with other individuals before we can hope to expand their view to a global perspective; thus, the second step in our hierarchy is to encourage individual cooperation.

Children can be spontaneously cooperative; in our society, however, reinforcement of individual competition often overshadows this tendency. There certainly are times when competition is appropriate, but it becomes a problem when it interferes with cooperative efforts that are essential for accomplishing a given task. Teachers must provide students with opportunities to practice cooperation and to actively build a positive way of thinking about their relationships with others.

Even as we seek to teach cooperation and to encourage students to work together, we recognize that any endeavor involving more than one person will eventually encounter some measure of conflict. Therefore, as we maintain order in the classroom, we must also develop ways to help students reach the next level in their study of peace and to actively become peacemakers among themselves. To this end, teachers need to demonstrate effective and fair techniques for the resolution of conflicts.

By emphasizing the importance of finding common ground between antagonists and the necessity of respecting the rights and opinions of others, teachers help students to better understand the nature of conflict and to recognize that there are not always right and wrong answers to disagreements among persons, groups, or nations. Children who are learning to understand conflict resolution and peacemaking need to recognize that these do not mean simply the elimination of conflict, but often include new rules and responsibilities to satisfy the parties involved.

Through observations of peacemaking and participation in trying to maintain a peaceful atmosphere in the classroom, students will also develop a new understanding of what it means to be a peacemaker, including attempts to overtly settle disputes as well as the efforts of anyone who works in any active way, large or small, to build a sense of community, harmony, cooperation, and justice to make the world a better place. Once students think of peacemaking in this way, they are able to identify these qualities in themselves and in the people around them. Participation in discussions about this helps them to understand how their peacemaking efforts are important to their community and to the world.

Finally, perhaps the greatest challenge for educators who actively try to teach for peace is the task of encouraging students to envision a positive world of peace in the future and to take actions toward making that vision a reality. As adults, we often unconsciously ignore events and forces which would interfere with such a vision. We have developed the ability to simply choose not to think about negative possibilities because challenges to our plans often make us feel anxious and helpless. This sense of powerlessness can be assimilated by our students and translated into a sense of future lessness when they witness our frustration in the face of events over which we seem to have little control.

Through activities designed to help them act on responses they suggest to problems, both within and beyond the confines of their schoolyards, students can learn to recognize the importance of their own actions in effecting changes and bringing about a hopeful future. The philosophy behind teaching for peace also requires the teacher to have such a belief in his or her own actions.

This participatory step may not come easily; there are often bureaucratic obstacles to student activities that involve interacting with the community outside the school. Nevertheless, community action is essential for truly teaching students to wage peace; becoming involved in an active effort to solve a problem gives children, as well as adults, a real sense of power in making a contribution to a more peaceful world. This power will enable them to envision themselves as viable citizens, not only of their local communities, but of a larger global community in which their action or inaction does have an impact.

Instructional Methods for Teaching About Peace

Although we may be integrating the study of peace and peacemaking into instruction in traditional disciplines, we must also spend some time directly developing understanding of concepts related to peace before the students can use them for working on skills required in the regular curriculum, such as writing or critical thinking about events in history. The activities mentioned here are examples of ways to present these concepts using some methods already familiar to many educators and some which may be a little less conventional. For more suggestions, teachers may refer to *Perspectives: A Teaching Guide to Concepts of Peace*, a resource book compiled by Educators for Social Responsibility.

One method for initiating the process of defining "peace" is brainstorming. This exercise is useful in helping students go beyond their initial, often simplistic responses to develop a broader, action-based definition of "peace." To assist the students in moving from the disjointed jumble of responses offered in brainstorming to the careful analysis needed for the development of a definition, the teacher creates a semantic web on the board as the students suggest words that they associate with peace. Subsequently, semantic webs based on war and violence should also be developed. As the students examine the lists of responses, they should consider their emotional reactions to the words. What types of words do they associate with each concept? Are all the words representing excitement linked to violence? Or can there be any overlap between the action words in the two webs?

Some youngsters will need more than a study of language to be able to understand how an active definition of peace can be applied; they will need to experience active peace as the result of a cooperative effort, such as a simple activity involving musical instruments. The teacher assembles at least seven or eight rhythm instruments and asks five students to each choose one to play in this exercise. Without speaking, touching one another, or harming the instruments, they are first to play so that their music illustrates the opposite of peace. Then the teacher signals them to play together in a way that illustrates peace. It may take a while for them to reach a degree of harmony, so they should be given time to try before being silenced. In the class discussion which follows the music, the performers and the audience can talk about how well they think they were doing and what they were doing to try to achieve a "peaceful" sound. After several groups of students have tried this activity, it may be easier for the class to generate a definition of peace that extends beyond "peace and quiet" to include cooperative action.

Another cooperative activity that students usually enjoy involves groups of four or five students working together to create original drawings from big squiggles provided by the teacher. Although each of the groups has the same foundation from which to begin, by discussing the possibilities among themselves and working cooperatively within their groups, they produce very different final products. Because the goal of this activity is to practice cooperation, the students within a group must first share their ideas, drawing out quiet members of the group and making constructive comments about one another's ideas; and each member must draw a portion of the group's final product.

When all the groups have finished, the teacher leads a discussion of the cooperative strategies used by each to produce their drawings, encouraging the students to be specific in reporting behaviors that were particularly helpful in their cooperative efforts. When such an activity is introduced to the students, the teacher should make it clear that the cooperative effort, not the product of that effort, is the goal of the exercise. The students are evaluated on their fairness to all group members, on their willingness to listen to and to include the ideas of all members, and on their efforts to give positive feedback as ideas are presented. They should also evaluate themselves in their efforts to settle disputes and differences within the group.

In learning to settle conflicts in an appropriate, nonviolent fashion, students may need to practice effective communication techniques, such as active listening, which requires the listener to paraphrase what a speaker has said before reacting to it in order to clarify his understanding of the message. Although role-playing activities provide useful practice in communication, children often lack the maturity to disassociate themselves from the roles they play; therefore, frequent breaks in the action with input and feedback from the teacher and classmates may be needed to reduce the tension. Discussing the role play when it is finished allows the participants and the audience to address how the situation might have been prevented and how the characters felt in the situation. These hypothetical situations for resolution of conflicts will give students non-threatening experiences in dealing with problems and seeking imaginative solutions without the pressure of being emotionally involved in actual conflict. Students will gain more confidence in their abilities to face similar situations in their everyday relationships and grow to accept the notion that their peacemaking efforts are important and workable.

As they begin to experience peacemaking, we again need to help them broaden their concepts of peace by discussing what peace makers are like, what they do, people we think of as peace makers in our families and in our communities, and how we may be peace makers and for whom. This is an excellent topic for a writing activity, such as keeping a journal or writing a local newsletter. The students could also conduct a "peacewatch" to identify and formally acknowledge classmates or other persons in their school or community who are acting as peacemakers.

To expand their study of peacemaking beyond their own experience, children can study about well-known people who have played important roles as peacemakers in this country and the rest of the world. This is a typical part of today's curriculum even without the intent to study about peace; however, much of the information students receive is simplified and glorified. Choosing to focus on various famous historical figures and events, they might

enjoy conducting research that would allow them to form educated opinions about the real and supposed contributions of individuals and nations to building a world of peace. Interesting examples for study include Martin Luther King, Jr. and his involvement in the civil rights movement and the role of United Nations peacekeeping forces in areas of conflict throughout the world.

Literature, both for children and adults, can also provide countless examples of all types of peacemakers. Through discussion and analysis of books and stories containing such characters as Johnny Appleseed and Dr. Seuss' Lorax, students can gain a better understanding of the roles they can play in building a peaceful world. Discussion should be focused on peacemakers as risktakers, individuals who actively seek to change things that they know are not good or could be better. The concept of bravery in peacemaking should not be left out, and children should be encouraged to recognize that even the smallest character can be an effective peacemaker.

Moving from this active understanding of peacemaking to the development of a real vision of a world of peace in the future requires the students to develop confidence that they can make changes in the world. A first step toward this is to help them think of things that are changing in their lives and recognize ways in which they have already caused changes to occur. Such a discussion may include changes in the way they look or the way they dress or the colors of their bedrooms, things which change quickly or slowly, and even things which never change.

From this they can move on to brainstorming suggestions of other things they would like to see change. Although they will probably begin with statements of things they think are unfair in their personal experience, the teacher should encourage them to eventually look beyond their own circle to the broader environment and social world around them. Not only must they voice the problems they see, but they must also suggest possibilities for solving them and describe the way they would like things to be if the problems no longer existed. These suggestions need not be practical; the goal is not for the students to solve all the social ills of the world in one afternoon, but rather for them to become aware of situations that are in need of solutions and to think freely and imaginatively about how they think the world could be a better place.

As the students become accustomed to the idea of seeking solutions to problems, they will only gain a real sense of power and purpose by putting some of their ideas into immediate action. They should examine the lists of problems and solutions they have outlined, searching this time for situations for which they can take practical action. This may develop into a project to pick up the trash in the neighborhood around the school, to collect food and assist at a shelter for the homeless, or to begin a tutoring program for younger students who are having trouble with their schoolwork. They may want to take their concerns into the public arena and write letters to local, state, or national leaders to seek further support for their efforts and the issues they feel are important. They may wish to join with national or international organizations, such as UNICEF, that are working on similar issues.

The value in such activities lies in helping students to see themselves as agents with important contributions to make to the world of the future; they will begin to see their individual actions as important in building a world of peace. Contributing to changes with global impact must begin with actions on an individual level inspired by a dynamic concept of peace, a desire for cooperation with others, a sense of worth as a peacemaker, and confidence in one's vision for a better world.

Katherine London is a teacher in the Orleans Parish School System.

Revising the American Character: Perspectives on Global Education and Multicultural Education

Stephan M. Fain

Introduction

When the play *The Melting Pot* opened in New York City in 1908, it was a great success for it gave life to an ideological position widely accepted within the United States. This ideology was fundamental to the development of American education. Literally millions of non-English speaking southern and eastern Europeans came to the United States between the 1880s and 1921 when the U.S. Congress severely limited immigration. Terms such as "assimilation" and "amalgamation" were closely related to this period and are to this day deeply rooted in the "American Character," or, if you prefer, the American culture. Most Americans believed that these millions of newcomers needed to be "Americanized" for their sake as well as that of the nation. Typical of the educational scholars of the day, Ellwood P. Cubberley observed in 1934:

"The problem which faced and still faces the United States is that of assimilating these thousands of foreigners into our national life and citizenship." Cubberley goes on to point out that, "The world war finally opened the eyes of our people to the danger of having groups of non-assimilated peoples living among us, and a determined effort was made, after the close of the war, to Americanize those who were here."[1]

What is also important to keep in mind is that these immigrants had known abject poverty in their countries of origin and were, for the most part, without the benefits of education. By and large, they were willing to forget their homelands and to make their children "good American children." They gave significant impetus not only to their own assimilation, but to the isolationism from world affairs that dominated American policies after World War I.

The processes of "Americanizing" these immigrants became, in great measure, the purpose of the modern American school. This is the school described so well by Callahan in *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*. Modeled after the factory and driven by a commitment to efficiency, this school reflected the dominant society's infatuation with business and business practice. Additionally, this school was rich in rhetoric. Through the use of literature and history, schools took up the task of character education. The "American Way" became a mindset that served to direct the development of the school. Whether it was a story in McGuffey's Reader or one by Horatio Alger, doing the "right thing" and "winning" represented the "American Way." Heroes such as Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln represented honesty, integrity, and fairness and these were characteristics which were integral to the concept of the "American Way."[2]

For many there was a sense of peoplehood which was central to the "American Character" and a sense of hope that gave personal and collective meaning to the development of this character in the immigrant. The "melting pot" may not have accurately reflected what was happening in American society, but its popularity as a concept reflected the potential of the American experience for the immigrant and "the American."

There were those who resisted the moves to "Americanize" the immigrants and there were those who sought to redefine the mission of the schools in relation to the advancement of the State. In the first case we have examples of groups of individuals who saw themselves as being both American and something else at the same time. These groups included Irish Americans, Italian Americans,

Polish Americans, German Americans, Jewish Americans . . . and so on. Lawrence Cremin notes the efforts of Israel Friedlander of the Jewish Theological Seminary who, in 1907, advocated that the Jews adapt to America in ways which would "sacrifice nothing that is essential to Judaism . . . [and] preserve and foster . . . Jewish distinctiveness and originality."[1] The desire to preserve distinctiveness and originality was shared by others who organized themselves in associations like the Polish National Alliance and the Order of Sons of Italy or those who maintained the language of their native lands in "semi-private" conversation, in newspapers, and in churches. And there were those who asserted themselves at the ballot box. For example, in 1916 Woodrow Wilson did not carry a single state in which Catholics were a significant force because there was general dissatisfaction with his Mexican and Irish policies.

Looking back, one is forced to conclude that the melting pot metaphor was a romantic, sentimental reaction to a social phenomena, not fully understood by those who were strengthened by its appeal. Yet, it seems that something was going on which gave a level of validity to this social illusion. Cubberley (1909) spoke of the United States as representing the most cosmopolitan mixture of peoples and races to be found anywhere on the face of the Earth. He suggested that his point would be made if we "take stock of our neighbors" — which he proceeds to do:

> . . . We buy our groceries of Knudsen and Larsen, our meats of Klieber and Engelmeier, our bread of Rudolf Krause, Peter Petarovich delivers our milk, Giuseppe Battali removes our garbage, Swen Swensen delivers our ice, Takahira Matsui is our cook . . . "

Then in a footnote Cubberley makes the point which for so many is the proof of the success of America. "The way these newer peoples have sought educational advantages and found their way through our colleges is well revealed by an election of 30 seniors to Phi Beta Kappa in January, 1930 at Columbia College, New York City." Of the 30 seniors, 15 names were "ethnic," non-Anglo Teutonic.

The victories over the depression and the enemy forces and the dropping of the atomic bomb enhanced the dynamic American spirit. The spiritual binding of a people who lose their sons in war and the shared pride of a people resulting from victories in wars, have historically unified nations. So it was with America after World War II. The passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (the G.I. Bill) contributed to a popular advancement of American society. The movies made during and after the war provided popular proof that Cubberley's neighborhood was a true picture of America.

The schools of modern America developed as the nation developed. There were scores of individuals and groups which offered criticism, advice, and warning. There were business-oriented claims that the schools were neglecting the needs of society by not doing more vocational training, and there were those who saw the people of America, especially the poor, being used and abused. Through all of this there was, by most measures, continual economic advancement.

The metaphors of assimilation functioned inadequately for populations such as the Blacks and the American Indians who could not or would not become Americanized. Even when they shared in economic improvement — and there is much evidence that most of them did not — they experienced prejudice that could not be mitigated by Americanization because their differences were physiological and immutable.

Between assimilation and international isolationism, the United States became a nation singularly ignorant of other cultures. This was a rather odd situation for a nation that owed its settlement to so many disparate ethnic groups. The impact of rapid technological development, especially in mass communications after World War II, the Marshall Plan efforts to restore devastated nations to a reasonable level of economic viability, and the growing activism of America's "non-meltable" minorities made for a new cultural consciousness that emphasized diversity rather than similarity. It was really a fundamental redefinition of the American character to pluralism and globalism. American education has had to respond to a reconceptualized American character.

The purpose of this paper is to examine two contemporary curricular responses to the need for change and social adjustment which is evident in contemporary education. In particular, this paper will look at multicultural education and global education. These curricular responses have been selected as each represents a popular contemporary reform movement linked directly to a redefining of the American society both internally and internationally. Hopefully, this examination will open opportunities for "criticism" (see Eisner) so we may better understand what we are about as we engage in the processes of curriculum making.[2]

Definitions and Descriptions

Multicultural education can be seen as a curriculum devise often associated with the entire school curriculum even though it has a special relationship with the social studies. It recognizes individuals and their cultures as separate from, yet interactive with, the greater (dominant) society. Multicultural education can also be viewed as a logical reaction to attempts at assimilating individuals and groups who wish to be recognized as different from others while sharing in the collective. Finally, multicultural education can be defined as a curriculum device designed to heighten the awareness of others about people or groups different from their own.[3] The concept of multicultural education can be accurately extended to parallel, if not fully embrace, a commitment to the concept of cultural pluralism. Edwina Hoffman describes this conception as follows: ". . . Arguing that certain groups have never been adequately assimilated under the "melting pot" philosophy, the pluralists wish to preserve the cultural and linguistic integrity of the minority groups through the legitimacy bestowed by the

presence in the curriculum of public schools."[11] In this sense, multicultural education differs from what one might call multiculturalism. The emphasis on "legitimation" is significant; it speaks to the intent of the educative process.

James Banks offers 10 paradigms for multicultural education. These run the gamut from a traditional academic rationalists position of content in the form of ethnic studies units, through conservative programs stressing acquisition of a second language, prejudice reduction, and the integration of ethnic content, to programs which advocate self-actualization for the purpose of increasing "the self-concept and academic achievement of ethnic minority groups," and finally to a set of paradigms which are intended to radically change the schools.[12] In each case the paradigm represents an attempt to legitimize a people (in the broadest cultural sense of the term) through placement in the curriculum. Looked at this way, multicultural education is "power seeking" rather than power sharing.

The conviction that multicultural education is power seeking grows from the realization that in general, designated minority cultures are included in the proposed curriculum for social intervention in which the dominant culture is taken for granted (to the extent of almost total omission). Further, an analysis of the 10 paradigms offered by Banks reveals that only four seek "intergrative goals" (my term) and only two of the four seek this "intergrative goal" as primary. It happens that these two paradigms are labeled "Racism" and "Assimilationism."

Global education is a movement within the social studies field of long standing. The post-World War II concern with global education can be traced to the 1968 Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies: *International Dimensions in the Social Studies*, which focused on the theme of teaching world affairs for all social studies.[13] Ten years later, John Goodlad clarified global education by explaining that traditional curricula intended to teach appreciation of others had forced a kind of thinking, best described as "we-they:" "These programs promote nationalism and, to some degree, *inter*-nationalism but rarely global awareness.[14] A contemporary definition of global education is offered by Willard Kniep in a recent issue of *Social Education*. He explains that global education is an extension of the mission of the curriculum by "enlarging the vision and meaning of citizenship to include not only the local community, the state, and the nation, but also the global community."[15] In this definition two elements are united and in unity they give form to a theme. There is the element of citizenship which speaks to an ethic of responsibility and the element of mission which defines the scope of the movement.

Working from this construct, global education can be seen as a movement intended to stimulate responsible citizens to take up the cause of maintaining a free and open society — a democracy, if you will. The interests of this society will transcend national boundaries and internal problems. The traditional social studies was intended to heighten awareness of the social problems facing a modern industrial society.[16] Global education appears to be a restatement of the traditional social studies adapted to the vision of a global society.

In a very real and positive sense, global education is progressive in nature and orientation. In a direct way it seeks to *progress* by advancing an ethic of "mutualism" (my term). In schools of Dade County, Florida, global education advances such concepts as international trade, international tourism, international banking, international agriculture, immigration to the United States, the potential of global war, and a concern for our global environment human rights, poverty and the poor, and "Being a World Citizen in Dade County."[17] The needs and concerns of the business establishment are stressed in this curriculum. In Dade County, it is an established fact that the international business community represents the economic future. In a lesson titled "The Many Faces of Dade County: Blacks, Hispanics, Anglo . . . What's In a Label?" a stated objective is: "Students will discover how little the labels "Black," "Hispanic," and "Anglo" tell us about the true ethnic and cultural composition of Dade County.[18] The lesson appears to be stressing that individual differences should be appreciated but that it is important to understand that many identifying characteristics of ethnic groups are both unique and shared.[19]

These examples demonstrate that global education is traditional in orientation. The modern American school has always nurtured the relationship between schooling and national economic development and individual differences and unifying similarities. This spirit of global education is captured in the following response to the question, "Shouldn't elementary schools be concentrating on patriotism instead of global concerns?"[20]

> Global education is not a thinly disguised attempt to sell some vague form of "one-worldism" or "world citizenship" to American schools. On the contrary, its purpose is to assure that our citizens are adequately prepared to function intelligently as decision-makers in the marketplace of ideas and at the ballot box in their local communities, in their own states, and as citizens of the United States of America . . . Adding a global dimension to a solid background of local, state, and national citizenship can only enhance, not detract in any way from, a major mission of our schools.[21]

And what is this "mission" which global education is intended to enhance? Obviously it is the development of responsible American citizens. In this sense, global education is truly conservative. However, global education shifts the concept of citizenship from isolationist to "cosmopolitan" — people who "care about what happens to their fellow human beings" and who "participate actively in efforts to improve the world."[22]

Analysis

What is the relationship between these two current movements in American education and what is the best way to consider each

one independently and in relation to the other? For the purpose of this paper, each movement will be considered in the light of what has been referred to thus far as "the American character." In order to do this, a set of four cultural ethics are proposed; each represents a component of the American mindset and, as such, each reveals a significant dimension of the "American character."[23] Each cultural ethic represents a set of cultural "oughts" which direct the behavior of those who are members of the culture; in this case the generalizations apply to the culture of mainstream America. Each cultural ethic will serve as a lens, if you will, through which global education and multicultural education can be examined. These cultural ethics are: democracy, equal opportunity, fraternity, and consent.

Democracy

If there is one value that the schools of the United State espouse it is *democracy*. Democracy is the key concept in the formation of the American character. ". . . democracy makes a particular claim: it defined the aim of the state, not as the welfare of a race, nation, or class, but as the happiness of its individual citizens."[24] This is an idea that is basic to the American character . . . we all have the opportunity to pursue happiness . . . what we argue about is the means of actualizing the opportunity. In this clarification of democracy a standard is identified which can be applied in an analysis of both multicultural education and global education. The question is put, where is the concern for the individual citizen? Is the citizen's happiness the "cause" advanced, or is the "cause" bigger than the citizen? Application of this value to the development of modern American education (1890-1950) reveals that business and industry did not see the happiness of the individual as the cause to be advanced. Rather, the individual was to be trained in ways that would advance the cause of business and industry. The citizen's pursuit of happiness was, at best, neglected and often intentionally ignored. The result was the development of curricula that did not correspond with a basic social value — the cultural ethic of *democracy*.

Both multicultural education and global education seek to empower individuals with tools and attitudes necessary for the pursuit of happiness. The language each uses links specific goals with special meanings and ties up the curriculum package with a ribbon woven of democracy. Each accepts and uses the cultural ethic of democracy as a structural element, but neither defines it beyond the spiritual level. This ethic is a part of the culture, and, as such, definitions seem superfluous and acceptance seems assured.

Equal Opportunity

A basic expectation held by contemporary Americans is that each person shall have his/her "chance" without regard to economic class, ethnicity, or sex. This is the cultural ethic of *equal opportunity*. This value speaks to suffrage and careers as well as education and domicile. This value is reflected in the liberal movements of our recent past — Social Security, the "New Deal," the "Great Society," and the Civil Rights movement.[25] Indeed, the very notion of the common school speaks to the fundamental character of this value in the development of American society. Serving as a standard, placement of this ethic against each curriculum under consideration reveals the nature of the "match" between curriculum and ethic.

Multicultural education has been shown to be power seeking. According to James Banks, multicultural education is a reform movement and its "most important goal . . . is to reform the major variables in the school environment so that students from all ethnic and racial groups will experience educational equity."[26] This movement is committed to the value of equal opportunity in the society in general and most particularly in the curriculum. Here we find a match as the cultural ethic and the curriculum strategy are politically fused into a rationale. It is now argued that learning a language is learning a culture and that learning about one's own culture is an opportunity of which no person should be deprived. Further, it is argued that learning about one's own culture builds a power base of self-esteem necessary for access to the democratic ethic. Thus, a bond is created between the cultural ethics of *democracy* and *equal opportunity* and bilingual/bicultural education is incorporated into the multicultural education movement.

Global education offers a somewhat different match when compared to the cultural ethic of equal opportunity. Justice, a moral sense of equity, that is how global education addresses equal opportunity. This sense of equity does not force confrontations, rather it leads toward compromise and conflict resolution. This curriculum model stresses *coexistence* and not revolution. Enriched by a strong sense of caring, mutuality, and appreciation, the movement appears mature and sophisticated rather than explosive and radical. It is clear that equal opportunity should be extended to all, but it is not clear if this ethic is to be applied in the same way to all people. For instance, no evidence is available to assist an interested educator in knowing whether the global view advocates differentiation when applying the ethic of equal opportunity to, let's say, the people of Manila, Manchester, or Miami. In other words, the commitment to the ethic is clear. Philosophically, there is a bond between the ethics of democracy and equality, but the lessons to be taught and learned are not as clear as is the commitment. In the case of the cultural ethic of equal opportunity the advocates of multicultural education are more clear about what ought to be done in school than are the advocates of global education. "Simple" and "direct" are descriptors which apply to the arguments advanced by the multiculturalists; "interrelated" and "multifaceted" capture the flavor of the arguments advanced by the globalist.

Fraternity

The third cultural ethic is *fraternity*. This ethic requires more than a commitment to desegregation; it requires a commitment to

the creation and maintenance of an integrated community. This ethic is seen in the development of urban neighborhoods and small rural towns . . . places where one feels known and at home.

In general, Americans tend to support ball teams connected to their home town or practice rituals which reinforce connections to their community; for instance, kids going from house to house collecting candy on Halloween, or the family attending a Thanksgiving or Memorial Day parade, or going to a picnic and fireworks on July Fourth, and/or attending the annual "big games" between local high schools. For many civic-minded folks the community is where you serve as a volunteer in order to advance the "common good." The fraternity is as broad or as narrow as a person's mindset. In the spirit of democracy and equality opportunity it opens, but it is special and valued because the community is also closed.

On the one hand, the "fraternity" could describe a narrowly defined group of fellows who stick together as loyal friends. On the other hand the ethic of fraternity opens the community to all who seek admission.[27] The key is in "belonging" — belonging to the American Legion, the Democratic or Republican party, the country club or the gang, the scouts, the ski club, the book club, or the bridge club . . . the power of the ethic is in believing that membership counts and that being a member counts. The way one ought to act is clear — loyalty is required, so is caring and "paying dues."

There is a significant difference between the way in which global education and multicultural education react to the ethic of fraternity and it is easily seen in their respective definitions of community. Global education defines community in terms of the world and problems such as trade, peace, economic development, hunger, and the advancement of mankind in general. Multicultural education defines the community in terms of designated groups of people and problems in terms of matters of "equity" (usually numerical), position (usually symbolic), and legitimacy (usually power-seeking).[28]

Consent

Each one of the three cultural ethics presented thus far stimulate actions; in turn, these actions give meaning to the ethics. As the cycle develops into a natural blend of ethics and actions, the character of a people is formed. The bonding agent in this process of formation shall be identified as the *ethic of consent*.[29]

The people's acceptance of a point of view is what ultimately gives meaning to a democratic society. Acceptance of the cultural ethics of *democracy, equal opportunity,* and *fraternity* provides the foundation upon which rests the American character. The social struggle is related to the interpretation of these ethics as people move to incorporate them into their lives. When an ethic is understood and accepted in the context of a moment it now becomes an *ethic of consent*. That is, actions must be taken to set right that which the people do not want. The actions to set the wrong right will be strengthened by the support generated by any or all of the ethics noted above.

For example, the Vietnam War was undertaken to advance "the cause of a democratic society" — a just cause. Initially, many Americans assumed that the citizens of Vietnam were seeking to be free of oppression — and there was support for this military effort. However, the attitude of the people changed . . . the cause was no longer just. Violations of the ethics of democracy (e.g., the people of Vietnam were not the "cause being advanced"), equal opportunity (e.g., returning veterans were not welcomed into all American Legion posts) forced a new mindset among the people. There was little popular support for the war, the ethic had shifted, and the now-powerful ethic was expressed in the support of leaving the war. Some said "leave now," some said, "leave with honor," but most said leave. The ethic of *consent* gave meaning and power to the people who, strengthened by the power, forced action leading to the end of the war.

In matters of education there is consensus that the schools of this country ought to teach responsible citizenship. Ultimately, for all proponents this means that the schools should be about developing thought patterns or mindset in young people which will help them in making the "right" choices as participating citizens.

That these young people accept the cultural ethics of democracy, equal opportunity, and fraternity is not the most significant issue. The critical issue seems to be how they are being "trained," if you will, to build the right mindset . . . what form will the cultural ethic of consent take as the future unfolds.

The formation of the mindset which will guide citizens was on the mind of William J. Bennett when he argued that:

> . . . Our children should know first about themselves . . . And then they should know about totalitarian regimes . . . And of course our students should know about the gradations of social, political, and economic arrangements in today's world between the few islands of the free and democratic and the vast encroaching ocean of the unfree and the despotic.[30]

The formation of this mindset is also a significant dimension of both of the curriculum strategies being discussed in this paper.

What is it that represents what we are calling the cultural ethic of *consent* in multicultural education? First, it is clear that power and legitimacy are central. Multicultural education represents an attempt to radically change the mission of the schools and the nature of society through the advocacy of a curriculum revision. It is the combination of the cultural ethics of *democracy, equal opportunity,* and *fraternity* which provide the energy for this movement. This energy takes the form of cultural consent and this provides the context for the curriculum reform. This combination of cultural ethics cannot be denied and multicultural education is firmly established as an expected curriculum reality. Each group selected for study becomes a "cause" in and of itself. Once established, this cause provides the flint to be rubbed against the stone of our cultural

ethics. The result is the spark and fire of consent, and in the flames the power and legitimacy sought are gained. The "cause" becomes, what Michael Apple refers to as "cultural capital."[31] The group is now in the game.

Global education is not advanced with the same radical spirit as is multicultural education. In the Dade County curriculum mentioned earlier, students are continually directed to discover things that logically demonstrate that the world is small and *inter*-related. This insight represents an important level of critical awareness for a citizen of the contemporary world. However, students are not guided as to how this knowledge *ought to affect* their actions as citizens.

The Dade County curriculum calls attention to "Eco-Catastrophe!", nuclear war, poverty, cultural difference, and crime.[32] It is as though the advocates of this curriculum have seen the horrors of a potentially terrible future and they seek to prevent it from happening. This view is taken from the recurring themes noted above. The ethic of consent advocated by this curriculum seems to be something like "think about it carefully and then make up your mind."

This open-ended approach to teaching represents a valid instructional strategy. However, it lacks the "ought" which an ethic requires. Since no *ethic of consent* is advanced, an ethic of consent must be arrived at by the students and teacher. If the cultural ethics of *democracy, equal opportunity*, and *fraternity* are espoused — and it has been shown that they are — and if these ethics are in use then a dilemma results when the issue of multicultural education is raised.

The "cultural capital," central to the multiculturalists position forces inclusion of "his issues" into the curriculum. The globalist is not against these issues and is forced to do one of several things. Global education can be replaced by multicultural education. In this case the needs of selected groups will be advanced over others and the "world view" theme will be restricted to generalizations drawn from the specific cases studied.[33] Or, students can be asked to identify a language spoken in their community and then be asked what is the second language they ought to learn.[34] This "ought" goes back to the ethics advanced by the multiculturalist and the local communities are advanced over global issues.

Secretary Bennett is troubled by the lack of an *ethic of consent* in global education. He asks:

> What do human rights mean? In 1982, the National Council for Social Studies published a booklet entitled "international Human Rights, Society, and the Schools." It was designed to help social studies teachers teach about human rights, as they should. But the booklet was written as a "small cosmic spaceship" called global education — a place, as we have seen, where judgment is suspended. It said there was more than one human rights tradition: "In Western Europe and the United States" — I am quoting — "civil and political rights such as freedom of speech, voting, and due process are of prime concern." You bet; that's right. But "in Eastern European countries, economic rights such as the right to work, to form trade unions, to strike, and to take vacations are considered essential. . . .The rights which are deemed most important depend upon the social, economic, legal, and political traditions of the people." That's wrong. Ask Lane Kirkland about workers' rights in Eastern Europe. Ask Lech Walesa.[35]

The secretary senses a danger that may result from the absence of *cultural consent* — it ought to be there somewhere. The secretary is correct; in global education "judgment is suspended."

Multicultural Education from a Global Perspective

It is appropriate that schools take on a global view in this age of electronic communication and universal vulnerability. The fact is that we are, in many ways, interdependent. Global education is a response to its time.

Earlier in this paper global education was described as progressive in nature and orientation. This description was not intended to suggest that global education is stuck in the past. Rather, the term "progressive" is used to describe global education as seeking to advance the cultural ethics underpinning of the American character in a changing time.

The contemporary globalists are very much like the Progressives George Counts spoke of in "Dare the School Build A New Social Order?" The spirit of reform was in them, but the power to cause action eluded them. Both movements had support from individuals and corporations which had/have what can be called a "worldly view" — Counts thought that most of these people were "romantic sentimentalists." This comparison can be shown to be meaningful if the words of George Counts are modified just a bit.

> . . . If [global education] is to be genuinely [global] it must emancipate itself from the influence of this [worldly class], face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish an organic relation with the community . . . be less frightened . . . of *imposition* and *indoctrination*. In a word, [global education] cannot place its trust [in an undefined paradigm of global awareness]."[36]

From this perspective the action lies not in global education but in multicultural education. The rationale for this movement is both rich and tangible. The multicultural movement faces the challenges outlined by Counts: it faces social issues squarely and courageously, it comes to grips with the realities of life, and it has an organic relationship with its constituents. But most of all, this movement is politically active and it is not sustained by individuals who are "romantic sentimentalists." It is sustained by individuals who share a "clarity of purpose" — they have a vision of what is right . . .

an ethic of consent to unify themselves. Further, the multiculturalists are not victims of objectivity. They are afraid of neither *imposition* nor *indoctrination*.

From a global perspective, multicultural education is politically strong. It has a "grass roots" flavor as it tends to be of the people and it is relevant for the same reason. It also holds the promise of the American character as it builds upon the cultural ethics of democracy, equal opportunity, and fraternity. Finally, few are opposed to this movement and it is strengthened by the social phenomena resulting from the cultural ethic of consent.

Conclusion

Within our culture, global education will have to provide a clearer insight into political, economic, and social problems through a process which will require that judgments are made and not withheld. If the movement fails to meet this challenge, global education will be co-opted entirely by interests such as the World Bank on one hand or the multiculturalists on the other. The bias for action resulting from *consent* gives global education its open and accepting agenda. However, its lack of clear boundaries of acceptability make it vulnerable. It cannot advocate everything. It must reject the right things for the right reasons. It cannot escape this character-building responsibility. If global education is open to the closed mind, then the movement must recognize that once the closed-minded are entrenched in the movement there will be no place in the curriculum for the open-minded world view.

Endnotes

Ellwood P. Cubberley. *Public Education in the United States: A Study and Interpretation of American Educational History* (Revised and Enlarged Edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1934. p. 488.

[2] Raymond E. Callahan. *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces That Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1982. (see chapters 3-7).

[3] See Merl Curti. *The Social Ideas of American Educators*. Totowa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co. 1966. (chapter 6); see also Carl N. Degler. *Out of Our Past: The Forces That Shaped Modern America*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers. 1962. (chapter 9); and Harold Rugg. *Foundations of American Education*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company. 1947. (chapter 11).

[4] Lawrence A. Cremin. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. New York: Vantage Books. 1961. p. 69.

[5] *Op. cit., Carl N. Degler. Out of Our Past.* pp. 286-289.

[6] *Op. cit., Ellwood P. Cubberley. Public Education in the United States.* pp. 486-487.

[7] Ibid. p. 487.

[8] I am thinking of the films that depict a group of soldiers crowded in a foxhole speaking of the "way it was back home" and "what kind of future is there for a young American?" My thoughts go something like this . . . we learn that Smith ("Smitty") is from a farm in Iowa, Rosenbaum's father owns a kosher deli in Brooklyn, Tecula ("Tek") is thinking of becoming a priest, Kelly aspires to become a cop in San Francisco just like his dad and uncles after the war is over, and "if I ever get out of this alive" Lewicki is going to leave the mining town and become a doctor.

[9] Elliot W. Eisner. *The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. 1979. pp. 190-192.

[10] James A. Banks. *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies* (Third edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1984. p. 21. Also see H. Prentice Baptiste, Jr. *Multicultural Education: A Synopsis*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America. 1979. pp. 16-17.

[11] Edwina T. Hoffman. "Melting or Melting Plot? — A Paradigm for American Education." Miami: Unpublished Paper. 1985. Presented at the University of South Florida Linguistics Conference. June, 1985. Edwina T. Hoffman is currently ESOL specialist with the Multifunctional Resource Center at Florida International University, Miami, Florida.

[12] James A. Banks. "Multicultural Education: Development, Paradigms, and Goals." in James A. Banks and James Lynch. *Multicultural Education in Western Societies*. New York: Praeger Publishers. 1986. pp. 10-21.

[13] James M. Becker and Howard D. Mehlinger (editors). *International Dimensions in the Social Studies: 38th Yearbook*. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies. 1968.

[14] John I. Goodlad. "Foreword" in James M. Becker (editor). *Schooling for a Global Age*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1979. p. xiii.

[15] Willard M. Kniep. "Social Studies Within a Global Education" in *Social Education*. National Council for the Social Studies Publication, Washington, D.C., November/December, 1986. p. 536.

[16] Harold Rugg. *Foundations of American Education*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company. 1947. pp. 574-575. On these pages Rugg outlines the development of the social studies. For this paper, it is Rugg's new social studies which I am calling traditional.

[17] Pedro R. Bermudez and Joseph I. Lamas. *Dade County in the Global Community: A Resource Guide for Teachers*. Boca Raton, Florida: Social Issues Resources Series, Inc. 1985. It should be pointed out that Dade County, Florida considered itself to be an

international center with special vested interests in international trade and tourism.

[18] Ibid. p. 5.

[19] Ibid.

[20] H. Thomas Collins. "East of Gibraltar, West of Japan: Questions and Answers About Global Education." in H. Thomas Collins and Sally Fanks Zakariya. *Getting Started in Global Education: A Primer for Principals and Teachers*. Arlington, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals. 1982. p. 18.

[21] Ibid. (quoting from James M. Becker, (editor) *Schooling for a Global Age*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1979.)

[22] Louise M. Berman and Alice Miel. *Education for World Cooperation*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi. 1983. p. 4.

[23] In *Habits of the Heart*, Bellah, et al. note that "individualism" is central to the American character. Max Lerner, in *America as a Civilization: The Basic Frame* argues for a set of tensions — he sees "three polar impulses" which divide Americans. He speaks of America as being "split" (pp. 72-73) . . . yet, in chapter three he paints a picture of a people bound together by a democratic spirit and the land. Also see the closing paragraph of *The American People in the Twentieth Century* by Oscar Handlin. My point is that, although it may be illusive, the existence of an American character is well established. (see notes below)

[24] Abraham Kaplan. *American Ethics and Public Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1963. p. 21.

[25] Robert N. Bellah, et al. *Habits of the Heart: Individual-ism and Commitment in American Life*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers. 1985. pp. 213-218.

[26] James A Banks. "Race, Ethnicity, and Schooling in the United States: Past, Present, and Future." in James A. Banks and James Lynch. *Multicultural Education in Western Societies*. New York: Praeger Publishers. 1986. pp. 43-47.

[27] Abraham Kaplan. *American Ethics and Public Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1963. pp. 104-107. Here Kaplan, remembering the spiritual truth found in the words written on the Statue of Liberty, recalls a visit to Washington, D.C.: ". . . When my father visited Washington for the first time, I stood with him under the dome of the Capitol and watched what he saw of America struggling with what he remembered of tsarist Russia. Then he asked, "Does it really belong to us?" " Kaplan responds: "It does indeed — it belongs to the people, to all the people — if we choose to make it our own." (p. 107) It also refers to the people of Warsaw, Indiana who, as a community, acted to censor books in the schools (see Stephen Arons. *Compelling Belief: The Culture of American Schooling*. Amherst, Massachusetts: The University of Massachusetts Press. 1968.

[28] I am using these terms as follows: equity relates to counting systems and affirmative action programs which argue for correspondence between the percentages of given groups in the general society with the workplace; position relates to placements on boards, committees, task forces . . . with a commitment to equity, and legitimacy speaks to equity in terms of the currency of the moment . . . the vote, the voice, position. Each of these matters of equity are intended to glean power from the mainstream culture and direct it inward for self-improvement and self-advancement within a dominant society.

[29] Harold Rugg. *Foundations of American Education*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company. 1947. pp. 366-393. Here we find a discussion on the rationale that Rugg calls the "psychology of consent." He points out that what is agreed to, or accepted by, a people gives meanings to that specific group. Disagreements foster differences which often lead to the development of stereotypes and special interest groups which use cultural ethics or "great principles" to advance personal causes through censorship, propaganda, and stereotyping.

[30] William J. Bennett. "America, the World, and Our Schools." An address given at a conference of the Ethics and Public Policy Center. Washington, D.C.: Unpublished. December 5, 1986.

[31] Michael W. Apple. *Education and Power*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1982. see pp. 40-42, "What Schools Do and Do Not Do," pp. 45-52, "School Knowledge and Capital Accumulation" and pp. 165-170 "Reconstructing the Tradition."

[32] Ibid. Pedro R. Bermudez and Joseph I. Lamas. This list is taken from the curriculum but is not inclusive. Other topics are covered. The point of my argument is that no stands are taken with regard to what system of values or ethics should be applied in order to make global decisions.

[33] For instance, poverty within the United States can be seen as a problem generally affecting people who are not white. Then students can be asked to see if this holds true in the rest of the world.

[34] Most people in Dade County, Florida would probably elect Spanish as the language that ought to be learned. A globalist might suggest Russian as a better choice because it has possibilities for peace, Japanese or Chinese might be suggested as economically helpful, or an African language might be considered as one that could be helpful for international exchange and development.

[35] William J. Bennett. 1986.

[36] George S. Counts. *Dare the School Build a New Social Order*. New York, New York: Arno Press & The New York Times. 1969. pp. 9-10. Originally published in 1932 by The John Day Company. My replacement words are bracketed.

Stephan M. Fain is a professor of education at Florida International University.